# THE INFALLIBILITY OF THE Holy Scripture ASSERTED,

And the Pretended *INFALLIBILITY* OF The Church of ROME REFUTED:

In Answer to Two PAPERS and Two TREATISES OF Father *JOHNSON* a *ROMANIST*, about the GROUND thereof.

By *JOHN SHERMAN*, D. D.

WHERETO ARE PREFIXED

A Commendatory Epistle from the late Bishop of *NORWICH*:

AND,

A Letter of Approbation from Dr. *Tho. Pierce*, wherein is given a *Specimen* of Mr. *Cressy*'s Misadventures against his SERMON.

*LONDON*,

Printed by *E. Cotes*, for *Henry Eversden*, at the *Grey-hound* in St. *Paul*'s Church-yard, 1664.

## *To his Worthy Friend, Mr.* Samuel Tofte, *entruſted with the publication of the following Work; which the Author liv'd to* Print, *but* not *to* Publiſh.

*SIR,*

HAving received, with your *Letter*, the learned *Book* you ſent with it, I haſten to pay you my thanks for *both*; and in anſwer to the *former*, have done to the *latter* what you deſir'd. *You* (I doubt not) will *commend* me for complying ſo ſoon with ſo great a Stranger; But I have need of ſaying ſomething to *excuſe* my *Eaſineſs* to my ſelf. And the All I have to ſay, is entirely this: That notwithſtanding you are a Gentleman I *never* yet *ſaw*, nor till your Letter came to me, had ever *heard* of; yet Dr. *Sherman* was a perſon, whom having *never ſeen*, I had *heard* of *often*. I often heard he had been one, who ſuffer'd *many* things and *well*, for his King and Countrey; one in whom *Learning* and *Religion* had for many years met, and had equal ſhares. To which I add, that he was one of thoſe *Cambridge-men*, of whom

Θουκυδίδης ἐπαινέθη καὶ τῆ ἀληθείᾳ τῶν ἔργων, &c. Diod. Sic. lib 1.

Ξυνέβη μοι φόβον τὸν ἐμαυτῷ ἔπεσι κ) λυομένῳ πως ἀμφοτέροις τοῖς πράγμασι, κ) ὐκ ἦσσον τοῖς Πελοποννησίων, διὰ τὸ φυγεῖν, κ) ἰσχὺν τὸ αὐτῶν μᾶλλον ἀιδιᾶσαι. Thucyd. l 5.

(before I was admitted into that University) I should for many years together have had a very great *Envy*, but for my *Reverence*, and my *Love*, which were extremely much *greater*. For methinks I stand affected towards *Oxford* and *Cambridge* as *Thucydides* did to *Athens* and *Peloponnesus*, whereof the first was an unkind Mother, and the second a loving Nurse. Thence was he fitted (more than others) for an *Impartial Historian* of the Warr between both, because his *Gratitude* to the *one*, was as prevalent with him, as his *natural Affection* unto the *other*.

Growing thus kind to Dr. *Sherman*, and somewhat yet the kinder to him (at least the apter to express it this way) because he is not here in Being to thank me for it, I read as much of his Discourses in Confutation of *Father Johnson*, as would consist with my *greater*, though *less acceptable*, Employments. Perhaps I read what I *could* read with as much *eagerness* and *delight* since I saw it *printed*, as the most excellent Bishop *Hall* by a *written Copy*. And I am heartily glad to see that extant in 63. which such an exemplary Prelate so much commended to the publick in 54. He hath commended it indeed to so good a purpose, and the *work it self* will so deservedly commend *it self* to All Readers, (All I mean who have the *skill* to *compare* and *grasp* it, as well as

the *patience* to *read* it *through*, ) that should I say, how much I think it to be an acute and a solid piece, I should consider my self too much, and the Book too little.

Nothing pleaseth me more than the Condition of the *Subject*, on which the *Challenge* of the Jesuite drew forth his *Answer*. For the point of *Infallibility* must needs be *one* of the two *Pillars*, (whereof the Pope's pretended *Headship* or *Universal Pastorship* is the *other*,) wherewith the *Trumperies superstructed* must *stand* or *fall*. That as 'twas *skilfully* contriv'd by *Father Johnson*, to spend his strength in *securing* that *saving Error*, [*The Church of Rome cannot err*,] as giving excellent *security* to whatsoever *other Errors* his Church can *own*; and under which, as an *Asylum*, the grossest Follies they can *get by* do live in *safety*; so 'twas as happily resolv'd by Dr. *Sherman* (upon so good an Occasion given) to shew the *Feebleness* and *defects* even of that which does *hold up* the *Papal Grandeur*; and cannot choose but be acknowledg'd even by men of both sides, to be their *first* or their *second* most *Helpfull Engine*.

This does bring into my mind, what I was told some years agoe by Mr. *Patrick Cary* (when newly come out of *Italy*, wherein from his childhood he had been bred,) That having first been *convinc'd* by the little Treatise, which had been penn'd on that point

by

by his brother *Falkland*, That his belove'd *Roman Church* was *not unerrable*; He could not *hinder* his own *Discovery*, how very grievously she had *err'd*. Nor by consequence could he *hinder* his own *Conversion* from a Church still pretending to a *priviledge* of *not* being *able* to be *deceiv'd*, as soon as he found 'twas even *That*, that had *most* deceiv'd him. And truely, had I been bless'd but with a little of that *leisure* which some enjoy, whereby to have written some *Reply* to *Serenus Cressy*, who pretending to *confute*, has *escap'd* my Sermon, and only *fought* like a *Parthian*, by certain *dexterous Tergiversations*, though unlike a *Parthian* in point of *mischief*; neither *denying*, nor *disproving*, but still *evading* my Citations, and taking very great care to *obscure* his *own*; as well by making both the *Greek* and the *Latin* Fathers to *hold* their *peace* in *Greek* and *Latin*, and only *speak* in such *English* as He *affords* them, as by *concealing* both the *Pages* and the *Editions* of his Authors, for fear a *Protestant* should have *leisure* and *patience* too, whereby to bring them to a *strict* and a *speedy Trial*: I say, had I time to *Refute* his Book, which untill the other day I had not time enough to *Read*, (nor *then* quite through,) I should not inlarge on any point with greater *contentment* to my *Self*, or greater hope of *convincing* both *Him* and *His*, than That on which

which he hopes *most* to *guard* his *obstinacy* by.

For (that I may *touch* on that *Subject* which the Reverend Dr. *Sherman* hath largely *handled*, so as to add to *his* Thoughts what I find *uppermost* in mine *own*,) when the *Romanists* contend for the *Church of Rome's* being *Infallible*, they mean by the *Roman*, the *whole Church Catholick*; and by the *whole Church Catholick*, they * mean as *many* as *own* the *Pope* for their *Soveraign Pastor*. This is call'd (by a plainer phrase,) * *The present Visible Church, to which* (for all the *General Councils*) *the last Recourse is to be had.* But why rather to the *present* than to the *Primitive Church*? or why to the *present Church Visible*, rather than to the *four first General Councils*? Even because (saith * Mr. *Cressy*) *Universal Experience doth demonstrate it impossible, that any Writing can end a Debate between multitudes of persons interessed, and therefore not impartial or indifferent.* Thus still there is something, not only *fallible*, but *false*, whereby a *Romanist* is to judge *where* to find *Infallibility*; (for wheresoever *That* is, the *last Recourse* is to be made;) Because an *Experience* as *universal* as that whereof Mr. *Cressy* speaks, doth also *demonstrate* it *as impossible*, That *any present Church Visible* (much less that *His*) should put an *end* to a *Debate* between *multitudes* of *persons*, whose *Interest* and *Byasse*

* Father *Johnson*, P. 350.
* Father *Cressy*, P. 95.
* *Ibid.*

is *multifariously* divided as well as *They*. Men must *equally agree* (which they never will) first what is to be *meant* by the *present Visible Church*; and after *That*, that she is *Infallible*, before she can possibly put an *end* to all their *Dissensions* in their *Debates*.

But what does he mean by *the present Church Visible*? Does he mean *all the Churches that do submit unto the Pope as their Soveraign Pastor*, either *IN* or *OUT* of a *General Council*? If the *first*, he must mean either a *written* or *speaking* Council. If the *former*, Then he should not have *distinguish'd* it from the *present Church Visible*, as here he does. Then there needed no more then *One*, but *That* (by all means) must be a *standing General Council*, from the *beginning* of the Church till the *Day of Judgement*. And then the *Church* was never able to make her Members the *better* for her *Infallibility*, or to prove *she* had such a *privilege*, by being able to put an *End* to a *Debate between Multitudes* of different Interest and Judgement in several Nations, either *before* the *Nicæne* Council, which was the *first* that was *General*; or *since* the Council held at *Trent*, which they avow to be the *last*. But if he means only a *speaking Council*, then he confesses that *at present* there is *no* such *present Visible Church*, as can *Infallibly* put an *end* to the *Debate* above mention'd; even because there is *no such General*

ral *Council.* Which being ſo; where is the boaſted *Infallibility*? How ſhall we *find* or *comprehend* it? or how is any Creature the *wiſer* for it? And if he means (what was ſaid in the *ſecond Branch* of my *firſt Dilemma*,) *All the Churches that own the Pope as their Sovereign Paſtor*, not *in*, but *OUT* of a General Council, Then the *Pope* in his *Conclave*, or *College* of *Cardinals*, (which, by the way, is a *Conventicle*, though not a *Council*, not *Concilium*, but *Conciliabulum*,) muſt be the *ſole*, *proper ſpeaking Judge*, who can *end* ſuch a *Debate* as before we ſpake of; ſo that in *Him*, as in her *Head* the *preſent Viſible Church* does entirely lodge; at leaſt in reſpect of her *Infallible Judgement*; which none but the *Pope* (out of a Council) can *have* or *utter*. But thus the *Romaniſts* Abſurdities will be more ſhamefull than *before*. For the *Pope* may be an *Heretick*, if not an *Heathen*. Pope *Marcellinus* was the *firſt*, and Pope *Liberius* the *ſecond*. And there is no better arguing than to the *Aptitude* from the *Act*. Nay, in *ſome* of the 30 *Schiſms* which [a] *Onuphrius* reckons up in the *Church* of *Rome*, (before the word *Proteſtant* was ever heard of,) when *two* or *three* *Popes* did ſit *at once*, 'twas even impoſſible to determine, *which Pope* was the *true*, and which the *falſe*. The *Councils* of [b] *Conſtance* and [c] *Piſa* (whereof the *former*, by the way,

a Onuphr. *in Chro. p.* 50.

b *Concil. Conſtantienſe præcipuè congregatum extinguendi ſchiſmatis Cauſâ, quis eſſet verus Pontifex, vix agnoſcebat.* v. Hiſt. Concil. à Paulo V. Edit. To. 4. p. 127.

c *Statim illud in Controverſiam venit, Num Synodus Piſana in Illos potuerit animadvertere, cùm eorum alteruter verus eſſet Pontifex, ſed uter is eſſet non conſtaret.* ibid. p. Seqq.

was a *General Council*, in the Catalogue set forth by Pope *Paulus Quintus*,) were utterly at a *Losse* in their Debates of this matter. From whence it follows unavoidably, that Mr. *Cressy* must not dare to avow this *last* notion of *The present Visible Church*; as well because it is not *That*, to which he dares say *the last Recourse is to be had*, as because *she can too easily declare her sense in another way, than as she was ever represented by her Pastors out of all Nations, that is to say, by a General Counceil*, which yet *the present visible Church can never do*, saith Mr. *Cressy*, chap. 9. p. 95. But when I say, he must not dare to avow this *last* notion of the *present visible Church*, to which he gives the *last Recourse*, and to which he ascribes *Infallibility*: I mean, he must not *for the future*, not but that *for the present* he dares to do it; Because he tells us expressly, p. 97. (and as *dogmatically* too, as without a *proof*,) *That the present Superiours living and speaking must conclude all Controversies, their Interpretation of Scripture and Fathers, their Testimony of Tradition, must more then put to silence all contradiction of particular persons, or Churches; it must also subdue their mindes to an Assent, and this under the penalty of an Anathema, or cutting off from the body of Christ.*

This is said by Mr. *Cressy* concerning the *living* and *speaking Judges of his Church*, Judges for

for the time being in every Age. Quite *forgetting* what he had said not long before, (*p.* 95.) That *Reason, Inspiration,* and *Examples of Primitive Fathers*, must *joyntly* make up the *only Guide*, which *He affirms to be Infallible. For, unless they all concurr* (as he had said before that, *p.* 93.) *together with the present visible Governours* (to whom he there gives *a judging determining power*) *That which we take to be Reason, and Inspiration, and the sense of the Primitive Church, may deceive and misguide us.* Now besides that *this* saying destroyes the *former*, where no less was ascrib'd to the *present visible Superiours living and speaking*, than here is attributed to *all four Requisites in conjunction*; we know that *Reason* may be *deceiv'd*, *Inspiration* be *counterfeit* by some *unclean spirit*, (which fallible Reason must be the Judge of) primitive *Fathers* subject to *Error*, and *present* Superiours much more than *Primitive*: And, *many fallible* Guides can never make up one *Infallible*, any more than *many Planets* can make *one Sun*, or *many Acts* of finite *knowledge* one true *omniscience*. For as Mr. *Cressy* does confess, that *Infallibility* and *Omniscience, are incommunicable Attributes of God Himself*, (*p.* 98.) so he imply's a *contradiction*, when he saith they are *communicable* to any *creature*, such as is his *present visible Church*. And *another* Contradiction as bad, or worse, when he saith that

*a man, although of much Ignorance, may in a sort be Omniscient within his sphere,* (p. 99.) which is as if he should have said, That a man may be *able* to have a *knowledge of all things*, because he may *so know* them *All*, as to be *Ignorant* of *some*. But then, with the help of that ποῦ στῶ, the *meanest man* is as *omniscient*, as is his *Roman Catholick Church*; because (within his *determinate sphere*) he must needs have *a knowledge* of *All* he *knows*; and of *more* than she *knows* the *Roman Church* hath *no knowledge*. So again when he would shew how a *creature* may be *Infallible*, though he had said that God Himself is *incommunicably such*, (p. 98.) he has no better a ὑποστήριγμα than an implicit explication of an *Affirmative* by a *Negative*. *The immutable God can preserve mutable creatures from actual mutation*; [ibid.] thereby implying, that *the Immutable* cannot *communicate* his *incommunicable* Attribute of *Immutability* to any *creature*, even because he cannot possibly *perfect* a *creature* into *Himself*. But from *actual mutation* he can preserve *any* Creature, as well an *Ignorant single man*, as a *whole Church Catholick*. Thus by endeavouring to *uphold*, Mr. *Cressy* does throughly *destroy* his Doctrine: All he saith coming to this, That however *God only* is *undeceivable*; yet he is able to preserve his *deceivable creatures* from being *actually deceiv'd*. *Sed quid*

*hoc*

*boc ad Iphicli Boves?* The Question is not, Whether God can preserve *a Church* from being *actually in error*, (for so he *can*, and often *does*, *particular Members* of his Church,) But whether *de facto* he hath granted an *Inerrability*, or an *Impossibility* of *erring*, unto that which they call the *Roman Catholick Church*. Not whether the Church can be *actually false* in her opinions, but whether or no she is *Infallible*, or exempted by God from the *passive power* of giving *false* Judgement in points of Faith. Will Mr. *Cressy* so confound an *Adjective* in *Bilis*, with a *participle* derived from the passive *preterperfect Tense*, as either to argue *à non actu ad non potentiam*, or else to pass over from the *one* unto the *other*? Will he argue that *Adam* before his fall was *Impeccable*, because he yet was preserved from *actual sin*? or, that the *Church* was *Infallible* in the *Apostles* own *Times*, because she *was not* erroneous untill she *was*? He cannot sure be so destitute either of *Logick* or *Grammar* skill. I think it rather his skill to *dissemble both*; as finding no other way to dispute a whole Chapter for such a Doctrine, unless he either *begg's* or *forsakes* the Question.

But now to give him more Advantage than he is mindfull to give himself, when he allows so great a privilege to the *present Governours of the Church* in every Age, whom he will

will have to be the *living and ſpeaking Judges, to whom* (*without contradiction*) *all particular Churches* as well as *perſons, muſt meekly yield up their Aſſent*; Let us allow it to be his meaning, *not* that *Theſe* are *undeceivable*, but that God doth ſtill preſerve them from being *actually deceiv'd*. Was not Pope *Hildebrand* himſelf the *ſupreme ſpeaking Judge*, when yet the * *Council* at *Wormes* did ſet him out as a *Brand* of *Hell*? Was not *John* the 23. *the ſupreme ſpeaking Judge* of Mr *Creſſy's then preſent viſible Church*, when yet he openly *deny'd the Immortality of the ſoul*, and for *That* (with *other crimes*) was condemn'd by the *Council* then held at *Conſtance*? Were not *John* the 22. and *Anaſtaſius* the 2. the *ſupreme ſpeaking Judges* in their ſeveral Times, who yet were both ſtigmatiz'd for the Crime of *Hereſie*? Let Mr *Creſſy* now ſpeak like an honeſt man, Were ſuch *ſuperiours* as *theſe*, then *living and ſpeaking, to conclude all controverſies, to Interpret Scripture and the Fathers, to put to ſilence all particular Churches, to ſubdue mens mindes to an Aſſent, and this under the penalty of their being cut off from the body of Chriſt*? Let him read his own dictates, *p.* 97. It will but little mend the matter, to ſay, The Pope is but *one*, and that He ſpake of *All* Superiours: Becauſe, beſides that they may *All* have their *Byaſſes* and *Errors* as well as *He*, in caſe they are *all* conſulted with,

Ubi ſupra. p. 97.

* Imperial. Statut. apud Goldaſt. Tom. 1. p. 74.

Conc. Conſtantien. A. D. 1414. Seſſ. 11. Edit. Bin. To. 7. 1036. *Notoriè criminoſus de homicidio, veneficio, pertinax Hæreticus, Simoniacus, contra Articulum de Reſurrectione mortuorum dogmatizavit. - Et paulò ſuperius,— cum uxore fratris ſui & cum ſanctis monialibus* Inceſtum *commiſit* p. 1035.

with, (as they never are) 'Tis very evident that the *Pope* (like the *Sun* among the *Starres*) is *more* than *All* in all Cases. The greatest part of those *Councils* which they are pleas'd to call *General*, have been indeed little better than the meer *properties* of their *Popes*: which that I may not seem to say as one that loves to speak sharply, but rather as *compell'd* by their *own Accompts* of them, I shall here give an Instance in *one* or *two*.

A brief Accompt of the last Lateran Council.

In the last *Lateran Council* under *Julius the* 2. and *Leo the* 10. The *Holy Scriptures* (at the first Session) are humbly laid down at his *Holinesses Feet*; And, an Oath being administred, are formally *toucht* by the *Officials*. The *Pope* (in that Session) is call'd *The Prince of all the world*; and (in the next) *The Priest and King to be adored by all the People*, as being *most like to God Himself*. Accordingly (in the 3d) The *Kingdom of France* by Pope *Julius* is subjected to an *Interdict*, and the *Mart* held at *Lyons* transferr'd to *Geneva*. The *pragmatick Sanction* is rescinded in the *fourth*, for the improving of the *Trade* of *Ecclesiastical Hucksters*, the *buying* and *selling* of *Church-preferments*. The *Pope* is asserted as *Gods Lieutenant upon Earth, though not of equal merits*. (A very signal Condescension! and to be kept in everlasting Remembrance! *God* is *meekly acknowledg'd* to be *superiour* to *the Pope*.) In the fifth Session, *Julius*

*Ne fleveris Filia Sion (ut Episcopus Mod. usten. sis affatur Papam) quia* Ecce venit Leo de Tribu Juda, Radix David. *Ecce Tibi suscitavit Deus* Salvatorem &c. *Te*, Leo *Beatissime*, Salvatorem *expectamus*, *Te* Liberatorem venturum *speravimus*. Concil. Lateran. ult. Sess. 6. Bin. To. 3. p. 74.

*dies*, (another great Condescension!) And *Leo* his Successor is saluted, as no less than *the Lion of the Tribe of Judah*, *the Root of David*, the *Saviour* and *Deliverer* that was *to come*. (A pretty *clinch*, but a *blasphemous* complement, and unworthy a Bishop's mouth.) In the eighth and ninth Sessions, This *Lion Roars*; first against them that shall violate his *Decrees* in the present *Council*, to whom he threatens such a *Sentence* of *Excommunication*, as *none* but *Himself* could *absolve* them *from*. Next against the *Emperour*, *Kings*, and *Princes*, whom he chargeth *not to hinder* such as were coming to the *Council* under the *penalty* of incurring *God's* Displeasure and his own In the last of those two Sessions, *Antonius Puccius* tells *Leo*, how his *Eyes are darkned by the rutilant Brightness of his Divine Majesty*. —— *in him alone as the Vicar of God and of Christ*, *That saying of the Prophet ought again to have its completion*, *All the Kings of the Earth shall come and worship*, *All the Nations* under Heaven *shall do him service*. In a word, throughout the *whole Council*, nothing is carried by *counsel or consultation* of *Assessors*, (for *Assistants* I cannot call them,) nothing by *suffrages or votes* from them that make it wear, the name of a *General* Council; But, the *supreme present Judge* (to use the phrase of Mr. *Cressy*) as an *Infallible Dictator*, ordained *All*. This is constantly the *Preface* to each *Decree* in That

Divinæ Majestatis tuæ *conspectus*, *vigilanti cujus sul. org. imbecilles oculi mei caligant*, &c. Et paulo post, *In Te uno legitimo Christi* & Dei Vicario, *propheticum illud debuerit iterfus impleri*, Adorabunt eum omnes *Reges Terræ*, *omnes Gentes servient ei*. Ibid. Sess. 9. p. 114, 116.

Council,

Council, *Leo Episcopus, servus servorum Dei, ad perpetuam rei memoriam, approbante Concilio, &c.*

So again in their *last* and *best beloved* General Council, *All* the *Fathers* do but prepare convenient *matter* for *Decrees*, whereunto the *Pope's Fiat* does give the *life*. Their *two and twenty* years *contrivances* do end at last in [a] *meek Petition, That his Holiness will vouchsafe* to *confirm what they had done*; that is, to *inform* the lifeless *matters* they had prepared; which could not have the *nature* and *force* of *Articles* or *Decrees*, until the *Pope* had *breathed* on them the *Breath* of *Life*. So a little before That, [b] The *General Council* doth humbly hope, That if any *Difficulty* arise in the *receiving* of the *Canons*, or if any things *Doubtful* shall require a *Definition*, or *Declaration*, His *Holiness* will *provide* for the Necessities of the Provinces, for the Glory of God, and the Tranquillity of the Church, either by calling a *General Council*, if *He shall judge* it to be needful, or by *committing* the *Business* to such as He shall *think fit* to do it, or by what way *soever* He shall judge more *commodious*. All, upon the matter, both *is*, and *must* be, as *He pleaseth*; and when the *Council* is dissolv'd, He is *himself Tantamount* to a *General Council*. Indeed much *more*. For the *Council* did but *propose*, But *He* [c] *declares* and *define's by Apostolical Authority*. He [d] *com-*

Of the Council at Trent.

a Humiliter petimus nomine dicti Concilii œcumenici Tridentini, ut Sanctitas vestra dignetur confirmare *omnia & singula*, &c. Edit. Bin. Tom. 9. p. 442.

b *Si in his recipiendis aliqua Difficultas oriatur, aut aliqua inciderint quæ Declarationem aut Finitionem postulent, —— confidit sancta Synodus Pontificem curaturum —— &c.* videre expedire —— &c. Si necessarium judicaverit, &c. Si ei visum fuerit, &c. Ibid. p. 434.

c *Apostolicâ Auctoritate declaramus & definimus* p. 444.

d *Fidem sine ullâ Dubitatione haberi mandamus atq; decernimus* p. 443.

mand's and *decree's* by somewhat *more* than *Apostolical*, *That Faith without any Doubting* be had *by all* to *his Creed*; and all under the penalty of being *cut off from the Body of Christ*; notwithstanding *some part* of his *Creed* is.* *This*, That *Apocryphal writings and meer Traditions concerning Faith as well as Manners are by all to be receiv'd with as much Reverence* and *affection*, *as things proceeding from God the Holy Ghost*, or *from the mouth of our Lord Jesus Christ*.

* *Vide* Concil. Trident. Edit. Bin. excus. Genev. A. D. 1612. Tom. 9. Sess. 4. P. 354.

Now if a *Council* (as the *Lateran*) does only *Read* a Decree *in Fieri*, And a *Pope* (as the *Tenth Leo*) by saying *Placet*, does make it one in *Facto esse*; If a *Council* cannot be *currant*, unless it be *called* by the *Pope*, and by the *Pope praesided in*; yea if nothing done *in* it, can pass for *currant*, until the *Pope* hath *approved* of it, or until *he* hath made it become *Authentick* by an *Act of his Will*, or by a *word* of his *Mouth*; Mr. *Cressy* and *Father Johnson* who do so earnestly contend for a *subcœlestial Infallibility*, cannot chuse but *believe* (if at all they *believe* as well as *plead* it) That its real *Inhærence* is in the *Pope*, and only *said* to be in the *Council*, because it does more *become* the Error, and *set it off* to the People with *better Grace*. The *Reason* of what I say, is very *cogent in it self*; and that it may be so to *others*, I thus endeavour to make it *plain*. They say that *Councils* are not *good* or *currant*, unless *approved* of by the *Pope*. Nor does

does he give his *Approbation* until the *Council* is at an *end*. His *Approbation* is *after*; and not *before* it. From whence 'tis natural to Inferr, That he *approve's* not of the *Council*, becauſe *Infallibly good*, and therefore *currant*; (it would not then *need* his *Approbation*:) But the *Council* is *good* and *currant*, becauſe *He approve's* it. And why ſhould *That* be *ſaid*, unleſs becauſe He is *Infallible* with *them* that *ſay* it? Thus (I ſay) it is to *Them*, not Thus in *it ſelf*. For then there would follow this other Abſurdity, That if The *Council* hath *err'd*, it is becauſe the *Pope* hath *not approv'd* it. For let him but *approve*, and It hath *not err'd*, becauſe it hath every thing required to its *Infallibility*. If not, let them ſpeak; for I argue only *ad homines*, and (out of very great charity) try to make them *aſham'd* with their own *Devices*.

Now (to ſpeak a groſs Truth,) The *Approbation* of a *Council*, when a *Council* hath *done* with its *Conſultations*, cannot poſſibly have the virtue to effect that *ſuch* a *Council* ſhall *not have err'd*. For if it hath erred, it is *erroneous*, though He *approve's* it. If not, it is *orthodox*, though He *reject's* it. The *Emperours* who call'd *the firſt* and *trueſt* General Councils, did either not *care for*, or not *expect* his Approbation. Yet *Thoſe* were *the Councils*, either *not erring at all*, or at leaſt the *leaſt erring* of any other.

But let us yield Mr. *Cressy* yet more Advantage, and suppose him only to *mean*, what *once* he *saith*, (for he saith so *many* things, that he seem's to have *many*, and those *contradictory*, *meanings*,) * *A Church represented by her Pastors out of All Nations*, which *Pastors* out of *All Nations* make a * *General Council*; And that *This* only is *the Church*, to which he ascribes *Infallibility*. To which I answer, by two Degrees. First, by observing that he takes for *granted* what is *false*. For there was never *such* a *Council*, as to which *All Nations* did send their *Pastors*, and by consequence The *Church* was never *so Represented*; and by consequence *never Infallible*, if She can only be *Infallible* when *so Represented*, to wit, by the *Pastors* of *All Nations* that have *Christian Churches* in them. For, the first four *General* Councils were not *such* in *that* sense; And only were called *Oecumenical*, not for *Bellarmine's* Reason, but because they consisted of all the *Pastors* who were sent from *Those Nations* which made up *all the Roman Empire*, whose *Emperours* by a *figure* were call'd *the Masters of the world*. Beyond the limits of the *Empire*, *None* of those, or after-*Councils*, did ever reach. None went thither out of *Persia*, *India*, the *Inmost Arabia*, and *Æthiopia*, wherein the *Churches* were never subject to the *Roman Empire*; Nor yet out of *Britain*, *France*, and *Spain*, when being parted from

* Ch. 5. p. 95. Sect. 7.

* *Concilia Generalia dicuntur ea, quibus interesse possunt & debent Episcopi totius Orbis, (nisi legitimè impediantur) & quibus nemo recte præsidet nisi Summus Pontifex, aut alius ejus nomine. Inde enim dicuntur Oecumenica, id est, Orbis Totius Terræ Concilia.* Bellarm. Controv. Tom. 1. l. 1. de Concil. c. 4. p. 1096.

Οἱ πανταχοῦ τῆς οἰκουμένης. Concil. Chalced. Act. 1. Bin. To. 3. p. 30.

from the Empire, They became the *Peculiar* of *other Princes*. And as the *Empire* grew *scanty*, so the *Councils* in proportion did grow less *General*. Whose *Greatness* is to be *measur'd* not by the *number* of the *Bishops*, but by the *multitude* of the *Churches*, and by the *Greatness* of the *Regions* from which they come. But since the *Bishops of Rome*, with *other Rights* of the *Roman Empire*, have invaded *This* also, of *calling* and *præsiding* in General Councils, they have been only *call'd General*, for being a *Confluence* of *Pastors* out of *all the Papal Empire*. And therefore, according to Mr *Cressy*, They could not possibly be *Infallible*, because not *such*, as to which *All Nations did send their Pastors*.

Next I answer by observing, that the learned'st Romanists cannot agree about the *Nature* or *Number* of *General Councils*. For, first as to the *Nature*, The *General Councils* of the Romanists are * thus divided by themselves! Some (say they) are *approved* by the *Sea Apostolical* and *received* by the *Catholick Church*. 2 Some are *absolutely reprobated*. 3 Some are *reprobated* in *part*, and in *part approved*. 4 Some are *neither reprobated*, nor *approved*. Now since *each* of these *sorts* is said by Romanists to be *General*, and *General Councils* in the *general* are also said by *the same* to be *Infallible*; What do they but say in *effect* and *substance*, The *Church represented* in *General Councils* is either *absolutely*

* *Quædam sunt ab Apostolicâ sede approbata, atq; ab Eccl. fiâ universâ recepta, quædam omnino reprobata quædam partim reprobata partim approbata, quædam nec approbata, nec reprobata.* Bellarm. ubi supra. p. 1037.

*absolutely Infallible*, as in the *first* species of General Councils) or *altogether fallible*, (as in the *second*;) or *partly Infallible*, and *partly fallible*, (as in the *third*); or *neither fallible*, nor *infallible*, (as in the *fourth*.) If *General* Councils *cannot err*, Why do they *reprobate*, or *doubt* any of them? If they have sufficient *reason* both to *reprobate* some, and to *doubt* of others, Why do they call [a] *General Councils*? or, if *General* Councils can be *doubted* of at all, and that by *Them*, by what *Infallible Token* shall they know, either that the *Councils* are truly *General* and *Genuine*; or at least, that being *such*, they are *Infallible*? Of *Bellarmine's* 18 *General Councils*, which are his *first* and *best* species, he proves the *Approvedness* and *validity* by the Pope's præsiding in, or approving of them. His *General proof* is but this, [They are approved of by the *Pope*, and *receiv'd* by *Papists*.] And what is this but to *beg the Question*? The *first* 8 *Councils* he proves to be such, by the [b] *Decree of the Pope*. The *Nine that follow* he proves to be *approved*, *Because the Pope præsided in them*. And the *last* was *confirm'd* by *Pius Quartus*. So that a Council's αὐθεντία is derived from the *Pope*, and depend's upon his *Pleasure*. But now of those 18. there is a very great difference. For the *first four only* were *received* and *rever'd* by *Gregory* the *Great*, as were the *four* [c] *Gospels of Jesus Christ*. Which Reverence would have been due to the other *fourteen*,

[a] p. 1105, 1107, 1109. *Et inde constat, locutum esse Bellarminum ex sententiâ suâ, quia sic claudit Partitionem.* Quod membrum postremum in Conciliis particularibus *potissimum* locum habet. p. 1097. *Ergo membra priora in* Generalibus, *ut & postremum aliquatenùs, etiamsi non potissimùm.*

[b] Dist. 16. Can. sancta octo. apud Gratian. p. 60, 61.

[c] Gratian. Decret. par. 1. Dist. 5. *Huc spectat* Epist. Vigilii Papæ ad Eutychium, apud Concil. Edit. Bin. To. 8. p. 593.

*fourteen*, had they been of as great Authority, as they needs must have been, had all been æqually *Infallible*, in their opinion who own them *All*. And yet the *later Councils* had been *more valid* than the *former*, if tis *not* * *lawful* to call a Council, *without the Authority* of the *Pope*, as *Marcellus* his *Decretal* affirm's *it is not*. Secondly for the number of their *approved General Councils*, I see not how it can be agreed. For besides that the [e] *Greeks* receive no more than the *first seven*, The [f] *Lutherans* but *six*, The *Eutychians* in *Africa* no more than *three*, The *Nestorians* in the *East* no more than *two*, and the Polonian *Trinitarians* no more than *one*, (which Difference is acknowledged by *Bellarmine Himself*,): I say, besides This, I wonder when *Bellarmine* will be ever agreed with Pope *Paul the fifth*. The former *rejecting* the Council at *Constance* from the number of the *Approved*, which yet the [g] *Later* does admit of with *equal Reverence*. It was *reprobated* indeed by a *worse* than it self, to wit the *Council at Florence* next following after; But for decreeing *that a Council was above the Pope*, for which it *ought* to have been *approv'd*. And abating those things which consist not with the *Haughtiness* (but the just *Dignity*) of the Popes, It is as *generally* received as any *other*. Yet we need no better Argument to prove such a *Council* above a *Pope*, and the gross *fallibility*

d *Aliq. Romani Pontificis Authoritate Synodum aliquibus congregare non licet.* Ibid. Dist. 17.

e Concil. Florent. Sess. 5, & 6.

f Magdeburg. Cent. 8. c. 9. & Cent. 9. c. 9.

g V. Concil. Gen. à Paulo V. Edit. Tom. 4.

of *both together*, than an Historical Account of *That one Council*, as we find it set down by Pope *Paul the fifth*. The Third at *Constantinople*, which is commonly reckoned the *sixth General Council*, was by the 14th *at Toledo*, Can. 7. esteemed the *Fifth*. Implying the *former* under *Vigilius*, not to have been one of the *General Councils*, which yet with *other Councils* does pass for such without Question. And so much for the *number* of general Councils.

Last of all, let Mr. *Cressy* be allow'd to mean at the most Advantage, That his *General Councils* are said to be *Infallible*; not because they *cannot*, but *do* not err; for so he most *improperly*, but yet most *kindly* help's out himself, *chap. 9. p. 98.* But does he not think it was an Error in the *first Council* of *Nice*, (as in the third of *Constantinople*) to assent to *Paphnutius* his συγγωμὴ πρὸς τὴν ἰδίαν γυναῖκα συνοικίαν and *patronizing* the *marriage of Priests*, as both *Socrates*, and *Sozomen*, & the *Roman* * *Decree* do alike affirm? At least the *Council* of *Eliberis* (which was *contemporary* with That) Mr. *Cressy* will say was in an Error, for declaring it unlawful, to *paint* in the windows or walls of *Churches*, what is the *object* of *Adoration*. And so much the rather will he believe it to be an *Error*, because the *second Nicene general Council*, decreed that *Images* are to be *worship't*, and denounced an *Anathema*

Socrat. Hist. Eccl. l. 1. c. 8. Sozomen. l. 1. c. 23. Niceph. l. 8. c. 19.

* Dist. 32. Can. Nicen. V. Concil. Constantin. III. Can. 13. Concil. Elib. can. 36.

Concil. Nicen. 2. Act. 4. *Concil. Constant. quartum decrevit eundem Imaginum cultum.* Edit. Bin. Tom. 7. p. 1046.

them to all that *doubt* the *Truth* of it. Does he not think it was an *Error* in the *Council* of *Chalcedon*, to Decree unto the *Bishop* of *Constantinople*, *even in Causes Ecclesiastical*, an *equality* of *privileges* with the *Bishop* of *Rome*? Or does he not think it was an *Error* in the * *sixth General Council*, to *condemn* Pope *Honorius* as a *Monothelite*, and to decree that his *Name* should be *razed* out of the Church's *Diptychs*; seeing *another General Council*, since held at *Florence*, hath defined the *Pope to be the High-Priest over all the world, the Successor of St. Peter, Christ's Lieutenant, The Head of the Church, The Father and Teacher of all Christians, and one to whom in St. Peter our Lord Jesus Christ did deliver a full Power, as well to GOVERN, as to feed the Universal Church*? And did accordingly exauctorate the *Council* at *Constance*, for seating a *Council above* a *Pope*? Or is it not thought by Mr *Cressy*, that This *Florentine Council* was in an *Error*, in Granting the Roman Church a Power of *adding to the Creed*, which the General *Council of Chalcedon* had forbidden to be done under the *Penalty* of a *Curse*? as was * *observed* and *urg'd* by Pope *Vigilius* Himself, to *Eutychius* the *Patriarch* of *Constantinople*? Let Mr. *Cressy* but compare the *sixth General Council* (whose famous Canons were made *in Trullo*,) with the *Tridentine Canons*, and the General *practice* of his *Church*.

Concil. Chalced. Act. 15. Can 28. *Qui Canon geminus est, non obstante Binii subterfugio pudendo.*

* Concil. Constantinop III. Act. 13. Vide Notas in vitam Honor. Edit. Bin. Tom. 4. p. 572.

οὐ ζητῶ —— τὸν ἀρχιερέα Ῥωμαϊκὸν εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην τὸ πρωτεῖον κατέχειν, -- Διδάσκομεν δὲ τὸν Πέτρον, τοποτηρητὴν τὰ Χριστοῦ, καὶ πάσης συναξεως κορυφαῖον, καὶ πάντων Χριστιανῶν πατέρα τε καὶ διδάσκαλον ὑπάρχειν, καὶ τῷ μακαρίῳ καὶ κυρίως τὴν καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν, αὐτῷ παρὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ πλήρη ἐξουσίαν παραδεδόσθαι &c. Concil. Florent. Definit. Edit. Bin. To. 8. p. 854.

* ibid. Sess. 5. p. 593.

And sure I am, He will acknowledge that the one or the other hath foully err'd. It was *decreed* in the *sixth*, [a] That *married* men without scruple should be *admitted* into the *Priesthood*, and this without any *condition* of abstaining thence-forwards from *cohabitation*, lest *men* should seem to offer *Contumely* unto *God's* holy *Institution*. Yea (which is most to be observ'd) This was a *Canon made* professedly [b] *against the Canon* of the *Church of Rome*, whereunto is *confronted* the *antient Canon*, which is there said to be of *Apostolical Perfection*. Here the *Doctrin* and *Practice* of the *Church* of *Rome* is *condemn'd* by a *Council*, which is owned to be *General* by the *same Church of Rome*. The Church of *Rome* is also *condemn'd* by the *same* [c] *General Council* (in its 55 *Canon*,) and *commanded* to *conform* to the 65 *Canon* of the *Apostles* (from which they had scandalously departed) under *two great Pœnalties* therein expres't. To all which if I shall add, How the 8th *General Council* made a peremptory Decree, * *That the Image of Christ is to be worship't as the Gospel of God, That whosoever adore's it not, shall never see his Face at his second coming*, (never at least by *their Goodwill*;) *That the Pictures of Angels and all the Saints are in like manner to be adored, And that all who think otherwise are to be Anathematiz'd*; I hope Mr. *Cressy* and Father *Johnson* are not such Lovers of *Idolatry* and *Contradiction*, as not to know

a εἶτε ἀρεθὲν περὶ τοῦ χειροτονίαν &c. ἔτε ἀναλυτῶς κωλυόμενον ἐπὶ τρίτον βαθμὸν ἀναβιβάζεσθαι γαμετῆς συνοικεῖν νομίμῳ, &c. Conc. Constant. III. Can. 13. To. 5. p. 326. Edit. Bin. To. 5. p. 326.

b ἐπειδὴ ἐν τῇ Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐν τάξει κανόνος παραδίδοται διάγνωσθαι, &c. ——ἡμεῖς τοῖς Ἀρχαίοις ἐξακολουθοῦντες κανόσι τῆς Ἀποστολικῆς ἀκριβείας καὶ τάξεως, &c. ibid. p. 325, 326.

c Ibid. p. 338.

* τοῦ ἰσχύειν εἰκόνα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ὁμοτίμως τῇ βίβλῳ τῇ ἁγίων εὐαγγελίων προσκυνεῖσθαι διαπεφωνήκαμεν.—— εἴτις ἐν ᾧ προσκυνεῖ τοῦ εἰκόνα τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Χριστοῦ, μὴ ἴδῃ ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ τότε μορφοῦ, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τὰς εἰκόνας τῶν ἁγίων Ἀγγέλων, καθὼς αὐτὸς χαρακτηρίζει διὰ τῶν λογίων τῶν ἁγίων γραφῶν καὶ προσκυνῆται. Καὶ εἰ μή πως ἔχοντες Ἀνάθεμα ἔστωσαν. Concil. Constant. IV. Act. 9. Can. 3. Edit. Bin. Tom. 7. P. 977.

*know* and to *acknowledge* the *Fallibility* of their *Church* in a *general Council*. And as, on the *one* ſide, Their ſtedfaſt Belief That She *cannot err*, is enough to *confirm* them in all their *Errors*; So, to *convince* them on the *other* ſide of *that one Error*, will make them *ready* both to *ſee*, and *renounce* the *Reſt*. That it may ſeem to be a *vain*, or a *needleſs* Thing, for any man to be laviſh of *Time*, or *Labour*, in a particular *Ventilation* of *other* controverted Points, whilſt This of *Infallibility* remain's *untouch't*, or *undecided*. For if we ſhew them the *Abſurdities* of *Bread* and *Wine* being *tranſmuted* into the *Body* and *Blood* of *Chriſt*; or of being *ſo* tranſmuted into Human *Fleſh* and *Blood*, as to retain both the *Colour*, *Touch* and *Taſt*, and all *other Adjunct*s of *Bread* and *Wine*; or of its *ſo beginning now* to be (in the *Act* of *Conſecration*) the *numerical Body* of a *crucified Jeſus*, as to have been the *very* ſame under *Pontius Pilate*, as well as in the *Virgin's Womb*; or of its *beginning* to be as *often*, and of as many *ſeveral Ages*, as the *Prieſts* at their *Altars* ſhall *pleaſe* to *make* it; or of its being the *ſame Body*, whether eaten by a *Chriſtian*, or by a *Dog*: They will defend themſelves with This, That though 'tis *abſurd* and *impoſſible*, yet it is *neceſſarily true*, becauſe 'tis taught by That Church which cannot *deceive* or be *deceiv'd*. Whereas, if once we can convince them that ſhe is *able* to be *deceiv'd*, who had taught them to

believe she is *undeceivable*, (and that in matters of greatest moment,) They cannot chuse but *disapprove* and *forsake* her too, as the *greatest Deceiver* in all the world.

Thus I have done what you desir'd, if not as *amply*, or as *well*, yet at least as my *Time* (or my *want of Time* rather) would give me leave. Had I the *Tithe* of that *Leisure* I once *injoy'd*, I might have long ago *reply'd* to Mr. *Cressy's* whole Book, which I can hardly *now* say I have wholly *read*. Nor indeed do I intend to consider more of it then here I have; partly because I am inform'd that *the whole* is undertaken by *other men*; partly, because I am *prohibited* both by mine *Enemies* and my *Friends*, (though in several *senses*, and to several *ends*); but chiefly, because I am forbidden by *less-dispensable Employments*. For although I must confess, I think the Task very *easie*, and such as hath nothing in it of *difficult*, besides the *length*, which Mr. *Cressy's Misadventures* would make *unavoidable*, upon so *many* and *ample* subjects, (so as his *strength* doth chiefly lie in the *number* and *nature* of his *Infirmities*, which nakedly to *observe*, were to write a *Just Volume*) yet supposing a *Camel* already *loaded* with the *maximum quod sic* that his back will *bear*, the Addition of a *Feather* may serve to *break* it. Some may think me *Insufficient*, others *Indulgent* to my *Ease*, (and I am as *careless*, as they *unkind*.) But I have Witnesses to my Comfort,

both

both *within*, and *without* me, And God *above* is my *Witneſs* too, That I have little or no Time either to *read* or *write* Books, but what I *rob Nature* of, even by *ſtealing* it from my *Sleep*. Which being as *needful* as the *Oyl* whereby the *Lamp* is kept *burning*, my *Light* of *Life* cannot chuſe but be very *Dim*, and by *many* ſuch *Night-works* would be *extinguiſh't* I know, there are who would *teach* me, how to *live without ſleeping*, (as *Hierocles* his *Scholar* taught his *Horſe* a Thing *like it*; ) But they muſt pardon my *Refuſal* to put ſuch a *Trick* into *frequent practice*, the very *learning* of which is enough to *kill me*. Yet Sir, you ſee I was reſolv'd to *watch* a *Night* in *His* Service, in whom The vigilant D^r *Sherman* is *faln aſleep*. And now it would be high Time to bid you heartily *Good Night*, but that I ſee it begin's to be *Bright Morning*. And the ſame *Gallicinium* which calls up *others* to their *Labour*, does more *ſignificantly* bid me make haſte to *reſt*

Your Real Servant and Fellow-ſervant
in our one great Maſter
JESUS CHRIST,

*M. C.* Sept. 7. 1663.

*Tho. Pierce.*

# To the Reader.

*READER,*

Ho can do that for us as to tell us what every Scholar ſhould do? It is eaſie to know what they ſhould do Morally; they ſhould mind the good of the Church, not *dicendo pluraliter*: but the queſtion or queſt is, what they ſhould doe in way of Scholaſtical imployment, as ſuch.

It is true, in Nature, *Unumquodque eſt propter ſuam operationem*, Every thing is for its proper Operation; but what then ſhall they doe who are good for nothing? Shall they do nothing? No. It is yet, it may be, good for them to doe *Optimum quod ſic*. Onely ingage in Controverſies they ſhould not.

Neither did I ever intend to dip a pen in that inke, which is for those who can dip their pen ἐν τῷ νῷ in understanding, as he said; such as have for it a body, books, an head, an heart too: I think I can do the less, because I think so,

——*possunt quia posse videntur.*

The Case therefore is thus,

A paper was brought by a *Roman Catholike* to a Lady then in *Norwich*, for an Answer; She sent for me then there, wished me to Peruse it and Answer it; I shrunk my shoulders; she urged; I took it or undertook it, returned soon a short Answer; He replyed, I rejoyned: He then sent me a Treatise; I sent an Answer to it; He sent another Treatise; I began an answer to that: but before I had done, He had done in the Poets phrase, Exit.

*This the Narrative.*

And now have I more work, to satisfie some Demands. And the first is, Why I was somewhat long in answering the second *Treatise?*

To this I can say, First, that it might have been longer ere I had Answered the first, because

because a *Treatise*; Then length is answerable to length. And also I do freely Confesse that as I have too much of this βραδυτης, which unfits me for Speech; so have I too little of that ωκυτης, which should fit me for Expedition: Neither could I ever closely apply my self to this vast and voluminous Learning which others pretend to; but have been a rambler (if not at my Book yet) from my Book, upon the saddle, the seat of Health as he called it. And besides, I have had other work in the Church. Moreover, though others upon the 5. of *November* did preach, yet I was a good while in durance for preaching upon the 5. of *November*.

A second demand is this, why I should publish the papers? To this may I say with St. *Basil*, Εμοι γε το παντελως αγνωτισθαι πλειν ηρεθισθαι η τοις πολλοις Νεφελιοις but it seemed, an Answer was looked for; the party from whom it came, dead; the cause publike; the first paper *an Interpretative Challenge*; some of his party *have vaunted of a Conquest*; some have wished the Papers abroad; I had power over my own papers, which could not goe out without his; It is somewhat ingenuous to give some account of our time out of the *Colledge*, though those who took our places should also in reason have taken

taken these pains. And lastly, advised I was hereunto by two Bishops of Famous memory, who saw part of the papers. One of them the late Bishop of *Norwich*; whose *Life indeed was not so short as his Style*: But since his Style was so smooth and sweet that he might be said to have written his own Life in it, What use might he have been of now, if God had pleased? The other the late Bishop of *Exeter*, who was [illegible]; who wanted nothing to make us happy now, but life; who was

Βροτῶν ἐπ' ἄλγος Ἀσφαλὴς ὑφ' Ἡσυχᾳ.

And the former of these gave me his Letter for my Encouragement.

A third Question then, why so long ere they came out. To this may be Answered, that though they might have come out sooner, they were, it seems, reserved for better times. *Sunt hæc, Trajani temp ora*, in *Tacitus*'s sense. *A Discourse of Faith, keeps now some time with the Defender of the Faith.* And very good time it is for others who have been true to their King, to shew that they have not been false to Religion; and that they have not leered, as some have suspected them, towards the *Latitudinarian*. And yet also this is not very probable, *Ex natura rei*: for if Kings would think upon it,

it, there might be no *Popes*; since if *Popes* could well help it, there should be no Kings.

But this also can I affirm, that the Tract of years, since it was done, hath not altered or swelled the Book by one word in the body of it; though somewhat might have been mended and somewhat might have been added.

And if yet great exception be taken at the Book, because it is so great; I must say, that I know who could have prevented this: For if my Adversary would have spared the Debate *about the Faith of the Canon*, he needed not to have blotted so much paper about the Question in Effect, such as this, whether the *Objectum quod* might be the *Objectum quo*, or the *Medium of its own Knowledge*. And yet it may be, he hath gotten nothing by it; since the Church without Scripture, signifies little.

Me thinks if the understanding in its assent were a natural Subject to the will, it would not be improper for me to say, that I would believe much for Peace, in reverence to that of Saint *Basil*, πάντα γὰρ δεῖ τοῦτον ἕνεκα πράττειν τὸν ἄνθρωπον· but since the understanding looks for Divine Conviction in this Act, we must have it, as to Faith Divine from God, either in the Proposition, or in the Conclusion.

And I

And therefore I desire to study Truth, impartially, neither rejecting all that is said, lest I reject that which is true; nor receiving all that is said, lest I receive that which is false; and I should be Disposed rather to like the matter for truth, than truth for the matter of it: Because otherwise, we love truth but διὰ συμβεβηκὸς, and not upon its own account, as such.

So that if this their Infallibility (pretended) were either proved or quitted, we might rejoyce in more hope of Peace to Christendome. If it were sufficiently proved, we should presently yeild; if it were quitted, they might possibly yield. And I would the *Pope* would turn *Patriarch* again but untill it be Proved, and thank God for the *Nicene* πρωτεῖα, and no more.

To my Adversary, if I have shewed my self at all uncivil, I am very sory for it: and what unhandsome Reflexions there are made by him (if any) upon me, I put up upon good account. If the pen at any time makes a disorderly sally out unto a perstriction of the person, it is a Liberty which I had rather give than take. And his Papers are as well, and as whole printed as mine, and I am glad that they are printed in the same character, which is not usual.

And

And if I have made in mine any blots (as very likely I have) about *Isidor Clarius*, or any other Author, or Matter, I am very ready to acknowledge it; it being not in my way to pretend to infallibilitie; nor my mind to affect the Reputation of him that was denominated Αὐτοσοφός.

It is enough to me to have given any hints to others for better use. If I have found any smooth stone out of the Brook of Scripture, Let some able Pastour of the Church throw it at that *Roman Goliah*; and let it sink into his *Head*; and let Saint *Jerom's Sword* cut off not his *Head*, but his *Headship*. My inability yet will doe me this good, that it doth strongly prove their Infallibility not to be good; which such a Punie of the Church can go near to discompose and ruffle.

Towards an Epistle this sufficient; since I think my self not worthy to give any advice. Onely by my experience I may remind thee, that it is time for us to knit the vein again of the Spouse of Christ, in the breach whereof our Adversaries do so much triumph. This *Ulysses* would have, believe it thou canst not serve God more, nor the Roman better.

*Scissura domestica turbat*
*Rem populi, titubatque foris quod dissidet intus.*

And I wish that by the light of this conflict thou mightst see that the *Roman* and the *Sectarie* are both upon the Extremes; and that *the Church of England*, as to Religion and Government, goes, ἐν μέσῳ.

So then, Reader, since my Adversary hath also appealed unto thee, unto thee let him goe. As he in his Rhetoriques l. 1. ἔχεται αὐτοῦ

*Thy servant in Christ,*

*our good Master*

**Sh.**

# A Letter to his friend.

Worthy Sir,

I Have with much eagerness and delight run over your Polemical discourse, in answer to an interpretative kind of Challenge made by a confident, but close adversary; whose wit I cannot but commend, as in hiding his name, so in picking out so fit a time for the scattering of his insinuating papers; when our so lamentable distractions yeild him so favourable an advantage; So have we known ill neighbours take opportunity of their pilfring, when the house is on fire: So did the crafty Amalekite fall upon the hindmost of Israel, when they were faint, feeble, and tired with their travel. Although herein he hath made a good amends, and merited our thanks, in that his bold intimations have drawn you forth into the light, and fetcht from you this your abundantly satisfactory Answer for his full Conviction, and the settling of unstable minds in this busie Controversie. Certainly, there is not a greater Imposture in all Rome, then in the name and plea of the Church; as our Learned Bishop Morton hath long since laid it out, or that wins more of weak and injudicious soules: For what a short cut is here of all controversies in Religion? what a sure-seeming refuge for the soule? what a present and sensible Eviction of all gainsayers? The Catholike Church cannot erre; The Roman Church is the Catholike; The Dictates of that Church are as evident as infallible; The Scriptures are ambiguous; The Church is clear and conspicuous; we know where Rome stands; In the communion of that onely is salvation; Out of that Ark we drown; within it is perfect safety: May this be made good, Who would trouble his heart or his head with any further disquisition of truth? Who need to care for any other spiritual priviledge, then to be free of Rome? O easie security of our Faith! O cheap charter of assured Salvation! Whiles these plausible impostors goe thus about to flatter their ignorant:

*ignorant, and credulous Clients into a dangerous, if not deadly, misbelief, putting this broken reed into their hands; you have thus seasonably discovered, and checked their fraud, and clearly shewn to these simple and mis-taught souls, how unsafe it is for them to trust to so crazie and perilous a supportation, which must needs in stead of easing, wound them. I shall therefore hereupon expect much good issue from this your wellbestowed labour: Why should not this your so convictive discourse work effectually upon an ingenuous adversary, to win him to the acknowledgement of so well-manifested a truth? and settle those wavering minds, which seemed to be a little shaken with so strongly-confident suggestions, and prevent the danger of seducement in those poor souls, whose simplicity exposeth them to the subtile temptations of misguidance into errour. Such blessing of success I wish to your learned, and charitable work, and to your self, (who have ever approved your self so well deserving and pious a son of the Church of* England) *some better encouragement then these times have yet afforded either to you, or to*

*Higham, April 8. 1654.*

Your unfainedly devoted friend, and fellow-labourer in the work of the Lord,

Jos. Hall, *B. N.*

# POSITION.

IT is not ſufficient (to make one a Catholick in point of faith) that he believe the ſame things which the Catholick Church believeth, unleſs the Catholick Church be alſo the Ground of his belief: for whoſoever doth believe any point upon no other Ground, but only becauſe it ſeems to his private Judgment to be contained in Scripture, or to be in it ſelf true, yea though he ſhould believe in this manner every thing which the Church believeth, yet he would not be a Catholick, and ſo may be damned for want of faith.

And the Reaſon is, becauſe ſeeing that faith is, to believe a thing becauſe God revealeth it, and that there is no infallible way (without a Miracle) whereby God his Revelation cometh to us, but onely by the Churches Propoſition; it followeth, that we cannot believe any thing certainly upon the Motive of God his Revelation, unleſs our belief be likewiſe grounded upon the Churches Propoſition.

Wherefore the faith of a Catholick muſt conſiſt in ſubmitting his underſtanding, and adhering to the Church, and in believing every thing becauſe ſhe propoſeth it: for all other perſwaſions of our own diſcourſe are reſolved at laſt into our particular Judgments, or elſe into the Judgments of other particular Men; and ſo cannot breed in us Catholick and divine faith, but only Opinion, or humane belief.

## ANSWER.

THe Paper may be reſolved into a Suppoſition, and a Reaſon, and a Concluſion. To theſe in order.

1. Firſt, The Suppoſition, *It is not ſufficient to make one a Catholick, that he believe the ſame things that a Catholick doth believe, unleſs the Catholick Church be the Ground alſo of his belief, &c.* (as in the Amplification of it.)

This Suppoſition is indeed the main Poſition of the Pontificians, and that which is formally Conſtitutive of them in that Denomination; ſo that the Anſwer to it is not made as to a private Opinion, or the Opinion of a private Man, but as to the General Tenet of their Church, in the matter of it.

In the Terms, the word *Catholick* is to be diſtinguiſhed: for if they mean thereby ſuch an one as they account a Catholick, *viz.* one ſubject to the Church of *Rome* upon its own Authority, It is very true, that None is ſuch a Catholick; but he that ſhall render his belief to them in all things upon this their Propoſal; and ſo whatſoever is the Material Object of their faith, yet the Formal Object is the Definition of the Church of *Rome*. But if there be a true Senſe, upon ancient Account alſo, of a Catholick who doth not believe Articles of faith upon the Propoſal of the Church; then there may be (in a true ſenſe) a Catholick now, who doth not make the Church the laſt Reſolutive of faith: For where the Scripture was acknowledged the Rule of Faith and Manners alſo, there the Authority of the Church was not the Determinative thereof: And that it was, will be made good, if it be deſired, by ſeveral Teſtimonies.

2. But ſecondly, give it, ſuppoſe it, that None is a Catholick in a right ſenſe, but he that believeth what the Church believeth, becauſe the Church believeth it; yet the *Romane* will not gain his purpoſe thereby, unleſs we would grant

grant this Supposition also, That the Church of *Rome* is the Catholick Church, which indeed is meant in the Paper, though wisely not expressed. But this supposition (that the Church of *Rome* is the Catholick Church) is not to be yielded, neither in regard of Comprehension, for that makes a contradiction; nor in regard of Dominion neither, for other Churches have not submitted themselves to their Authority: this needs no disproof from us, till it hath a proof from them.

And thirdly, If we should stand up to all that their Church (in particular) doth propose, and if we should assent to it upon their Account, we might be damned, not for our want of faith, but for Excess of faith in the Object Material, and for the Error of faith in the Formal Object: For we should believe more then is true, if we should believe whatsoever they believe, and somewhat also destructive of Articles in the Apostles Creed. And we should also believe upon the wrong Inductive, which is not the Authority of their Church (as we may see now in the Answer to the Reason.) 3.

The Reason hath in it somewhat true, somewhat false: True, *that faith is, to believe a thing because God revealeth it*: False, *that there is no Infallible way (without a Miracle) of his Revelation coming to us, but by their Church (which they suppose to be the Church) its Proposition.* For if the question be This, how shall we come to know whether the Church of *Rome* be the right Church, upon the Authority whereof we must ground our faith? Wherein shall we terminate our belief hereof? In the Authority of the Church of *Rome*, or not? We are to believe that (they say) which God hath revealed; but the Cause of our belief must be, because the Church proposeth it. So then, we must believe the Church of *Rome* upon her own testimony; and we must resolve all into this, that the Church of *Rome* is the right Church, although it be neither a Revelation, nor a natural Principle, such as this, that The Whole is

greater then the Part; which indeed gave the Occasion of that Check which was given to *Rome*, Greater is the Authority of the world, then of a City, *Orbis, quam Urbis.* [*S. Ieram. in Ep. ad Evagrium.*] Wherefore, *if the faith of a Catholick must consist in submitting his understanding, and adhering to the Church, and in believing every thing because she proposeth it*, (as is said in the Conclusion) yet it is not necessary that this Church should be the Church of *Rome*: For this (in proportion) would be to resolve our Persuasions into the Judgment of particular Men, because a Particular Church; which (according to the Paper) makes no Catholick faith, but an Opinion, or humane belief.

## REPLY.

*IN the Paper received, the Position which I gave*, It is not sufficient, &c. *is disliked, because it makes the Catholick Church the Ground of our belief; but in truth I find no reason given for such dislike, or any thing said against it, but what to me seems very strange, and is this*: If there be a true sense, upon ancient account also, of a Catholick, who doth not believe Articles of faith upon the Proposal of the Church, &c.

*To which I answer, that I would fain know, what Catholick upon ancient Account, did not believe Articles of faith upon the Proposal of the Church; or indeed, how can I account him a Catholick (without a palpable Contradiction) that doth not believe the Catholick Church?*

*S.* Iren. (*l.*3.*c.*4.) *saith*, We ought not to seek among others the truth which we may easily take and receive from the Church, seeing that the Apostles have most fully laid up in her (as into a rich Treasure-house, *or place where the* Depositum *of the Church is kept*) all things which are of truth; that every man that will, may take out of her the drink

drink of life. For this is the Entrance of life, but all the reſt are Thieves and Robbers: for which cauſe they are verily to be avoyded. But thoſe things which are of the Church, are with great diligence to be loved, and the tradition of truth is to be received.

*And the ſaid* Iren. (*l.* 4. *c.* 3.) *teſtifieth*, that the Church keepeth with moſt ſincere diligence the Apoſtles faith, and that which they preached.

*S.* Cypr. (*Ep. ad Cornel.*) *avoucheth*, that the Church alwayes holdeth that which ſhe firſt knew. *See alſo his Ep.* 69. *ad Florentium.*

*And S.* Aug. *had ſo great an Eſtimation of the Church, that he ſticked not to ſay* (*cont. Ep. Manich. quam vocant Fundamentum, c.* 5.) I would not believe the Goſpel, except the Authority of the Church did move me thereunto. *Moreover, diſputing againſt* Creſconius *concerning the baptiſm of Hereticks* (*l.* 1. *cont. Creſc.*) *he uſeth this diſcourſe*, Although of this (*that the baptiſme of Hereticks is true baptiſm*) there be no certain Example brought forth out of the Canonical Scriptures, yet alſo in this we keep the truth of the ſaid Scriptures, when as we do that which now hath pleaſed the whole Church, which the Authority of the Scriptures themſelves doth commend: That becauſe the Scripture can not deceive, whoſoever doth fear leſt that he be deceived through the Obſcurity of this queſtion, may ask Counſel touching it of the Church, whom without any doubt the Scripture it ſelf doth ſhew.

*The ſame S.* Aug. (*l.* 4. *de Trin. c.* 6.) *ſaith*, No lover of peace will be againſt the Church.

*And* (*Ep.* 118. *c.* 5.) *he plainly terms it*, Moſt inſolent madneſs, to diſpute againſt that which the whole Church holdeth.

*I will inſiſt no longer upon the Teſtimony of the Fathers* (*of which I might pour a whole ſhower againſt you*) *leſt I receive the ordinary Anſwer, that this their Opinion was one of their Nævi, Spots, or Blemiſhes, and therefore ſhall be rejected;*

but

*but will urge your own Authors and Professors, to whom perhaps you will give more Credit.*

Calvin (*upon Esay*) *expounding the words of the 59 Chap.* My Spirit which is in thee, and my words which I have put in thy Mouth, shall not depart from thy Mouth, and from the Mouth of thy Seed and of thy Seeds Seed, saith our Lord, from henceforward and for ever, *saith*, He promiseth that the Church shall never be deprived of this inestimable good, but that it shall alwayes be governed by the holy Ghost, and supported with heavenly doctrine.

*Again soon after*, The Promise is such, that the Lord will so assist the Church and have such care of her, that he will never suffer her to be deprived of true doctrine.

*And his Scholar* Beza (*de haret. à Civili Magistratu puniendis p.* 69.) *confesseth, that the Promise of our Saviour of the Assistance of the holy Ghost, was not made onely to the Apostles, but rather to the whole Church.*

D. Saravia (*in defens. tract. de div. Ministr. gradib. p.* 8.) *saith*, The holy Spirit which beareth rule in the Church, is the true Interpreter of Scriptures: from him therefore is to be fetched the true Interpretation: and since he cannot be contrary to himself, who ruled the Primitive Church, and governed the same by Bishops, those now to reject, is not, certes consonant to Verity.

*Our Lutheran Adversaries of* Wittenberg (*Harm. of Confess. Sect.* 10. *p.* 332, 333. *Confess. Witten. Art.* 30. *not onely confess the Church*, to have Authority to bear witness of the holy Scripture, and to interpret the same, *but also affirm*, that She hath received from her husband Christ a certain Rule (to wit, the Prophetical and Apostolical preaching) confirmed by Miracles from heaven, according unto the which she is bound to interpret those places of Scripture which seem to be obscure, and to judge of doctrines.

Field *also* (*l.* 4. *c.* 19, & 20. *Sect. The Second*) *acknowledgeth in the Church a* Rule of faith descending by tradition from the Apostles, *according unto which he will have the Scriptures expounded.*

And

*And we cannot doubt; but that she hath followed this Rule, having such assistance from Gods holy Spirit.*

*Furthermore, the same Dr.* Field (*in the Epistle to his Treatise of the Church*) *professeth thus,* Seeing the controversies of Religion are grown in number so many and in Nature so Intricate, that few have time and leisure, fewer strength of understanding to examine them; What remaineth for Men desirous of Satisfaction in things of such Consequence, but diligently to search out, which among all the Societies of Men in the World, is that blessed Company of holy Ones, that household of faith, that Spouse of Christ, and Church of the living God, which is the Pillar and Ground of Truth, that so they may embrace her Communion, follow her directions, and rest in her Judgment?

*For brevity, I will omit many other of our Adversaries, who are of the same Minde, and will now press harder upon you.*

*Surely, if we believe the Creed, the Church is* holy; *if the Scripture, She is the* Spouse *of our Saviour without spot or wrinkle: which Eulogies, and, indeed, glorious titles would nothing well become her, if she can teach us that which is false.*

*This Scripture also gives us these known doctrines and directions,* That the Church is the Pillar and Ground of Truth (1 *Tim.* 3. *v.* 15, *&c.*) That the Church is built upon a Rock, and the Gates of hell shall not prevail against her (*Matth.* 16. *v.* 18.) He that will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the Heathen and the Publican (*Matth.* 18. *v.* 17.) He that heareth you, heareth me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth me (*Luke* 10. *v.* 16.) Loe, I am with you even to the Consummation of the World (*Matth.* 28. *v.* 20.) I will ask the father, and he will give you another Paraclete, that he may abide with you, the Spirit of truth (*Jo.* 14. *v.* 16.) *And again,* yet many things I have to say unto you, but you cannot bear them now: but when the Spirit of truth cometh, he shall teach you all truth (*Jo.* 16. *v.* 12, 13.) (*to omit many other the like passages in Scripture.*)

Now

*Now this Church, whose Authority is thus warranted, did precede the Scripture, which for a great part thereof was written but upon Emergent Occasions* (as Field, Hook. Covel, *and other our Adversaries have confessed) which Occasions had they not been, perhaps we never had known this Scripture.*

*Suppose then we had lived in these times, when there had been no such Scripture* (as many did, *some part thereof being not written above sixty years after our Saviours Ascension*) *Ought we not then to have believed the Churches tradition and preached word? This Church was called* the Pillar and Ground of Truth, *before the words were seen in writing: and the like I might say by the other places before cited, which are now in the Scripture, but were delivered by word of mouth to the Church, before ever they were written; by all which places the Authority of the Church is commended to us, and we referred to the said Church, as a Guide in all our doubts: And all these words of God were no less to be believed and obeyed before they were written then since.*

*Even the Scripture it self is believed upon the Tradition and Authority of the Church* (*being part of the* Credenda *it proposeth*) *nor could we at this day have known which books were true* (*now Canonical*) *which Spurious, but by the Churches decision and Proposal* (*as the said learned Mr.* Hooker, *and other our Adversaries do acknowledge.*)

*Again, who doth not ground his belief upon the Church, upon what doth he ground it, but upon his own fancy, or private Interpretation of Scripture, the true Source and Nurse of all Heresy? And such as these may indeed be found upon ancient Account,* as Helvidius, Vigilantius, *and the rest of Hereticks, as the Catholick Church did then account them.*

*Now to that which is insinuated, That the Scripture was sometime acknowledged* the Rule of Faith and Manners, *it is answered, that it is so now; but this doth no way hinder the Churches being the Ground of our Belief: for the Church is both the Ground of our believing the Scripture, and also the Interpreter of Scripture* (*as is above confessed by our Adversaries*)

and

*and not private Spirit, which I can esteem no better then a fantastical, if not a fanatical opinion; and is Diametrically opposite to the words of the second of St.* Peter, (1.20.) No prophecy of Scripture is made by private interpretation.

*And all this spoken here, and in the Position,* &c. *of the Church, is meant of such a Church, as does truely deserve the name of* Catholick; *and so it will appear, that all the discourse in this paper I received of the* Roman *Church, considered as a Particular Church, or any other Particular Church, is but Impertinent and Extravagant.*

*Now also I must assure the* Answerer, *that the* Pontificians *do not make the Church of* Rome *the formal Object of their Faith (as he doth impose upon them) for they acknowledge that to be* the Revelation of God, or the authority of God revealing, *which causes their Belief to the Supernatural and Divine, and not (onely) Natural and Humane; as is the Belief that there is such a City as* Rome, *or that there is a* William *the Conquerour,* &c. *which kind of faith is All that Hereticks have, and All such as do not ground their Belief upon the Authority of the Church.*

*I cannot also but observe in the received paper, that it is improperly enough called* Excess of faith *(as it is there opposed to want of faith) to believe more then Necessary: for the Number of things believed does not alter the Nature of faith it self.*

*And lastly, I must tax him of false alledging the words in the* Reason, *thus,* there is no infallible way (without a Miracle) of his (Gods) Revelation coming to us, but by their Church, *whereas in the Paper delivered, it is* the Church (*abstracting from all Particular Churches, and meaning the true Church, which soever it is.*)

*And this is done, but to make way for that needless Excursion which there follows.*

# THE REJOYNDER.

*SIR,*

THere is no great reaſon for me to rejoyn:

Firſt, becauſe you wave the Application of your Diſcourſe, as to the *Roman* Church; which is not ordinary for thoſe of your Profeſſion when they ſpeak highly of the Catholique Church.

Secondly, Becauſe I may let you alone to anſwer the firſt paper with your ſecond, as to the main of it.

Thirdly, Becauſe the greateſt part of it hath one fault, not to conclude contradictorily.

Yet in Chriſtian reſpects to Truth and You, I ſhall endeavour meekly ſome return to your Reply, and (to differ as little as may be from you) I ſhall moſtly follow your own Order.

In the beginning you diſlike my diſlike of the ground of Faith without giving you any Reaſon.

*Anſwer*, I intended my anſwer as near as I could gueſſe to the deſign of your paper for the *Roman* Church; by Obedience to the Biſhop whereof *Bellarmine* in his *Catechiſm Engliſhed*, p. 65. 6, 7. doth deſcribe the Catholique Church. You will excuſe me then if I took the courſe to make my anſwer compendiouſly ſufficient to that drift, if you will hold with Papiſts herein. And if you would confeſſe, you meant the *Roman* Church by the Catholique, then I have given you ſuch a Reaſon againſt your Poſition

as

as you will ſay nothing to. And you may conſider that you directed your papet as to a Proteſtant, who is not contradiſtinguiſhed to a Catholique, but to a Papiſt; if you be a Papiſt why doe you diſſemble it to me? If you be not, why do we diſpute? And this Apology may be enough alſo to refute all your Objections againſt me, of impertinencies, and excurſions, and untrue Allegations, if you will take notice alſo of my Parentheſis.

And now my Reaſon intimated in a promiſe ſhall be made good in performance. And ſince you will in the queſtion about the Catholique Church abſtract from the *Roman* and all other particulars, I ſhall give ſome account of Catholiques, who did not make the authority of the Catholique Church the ground and cauſe of their Beleef, whereby onely God his Revelation cometh to us infallibly (as you expreſſe your ſelf in your firſt paper,) but this Prerogative they aſcribed to the Holy Scripture to be it, wherein and whereby we are infallibly aſſured of Gods Will, as to what we ſhould beleeve and do in order to ſalvation. That the authority of the Catholique Church is of uſe towards Faith, we deny not; but the cauſe and ground of Faith, and that whereby we are infallibly aſcertained of the mind of God, is not the Propoſition of the Church, but the Word of God. And ſuch being the ſtate of the queſtion betwixt us, I ſhall, for your ſhower of authorities you ſay you could power out againſt me, give you or ſhew you a cloud of witneſſes (as the Apoſtle ſpeaks *Hebr.* 12. 1.) againſt you. Your ſhower could not wet me through, but *this cloud may direct you home.*

This Doctrine of the Church of *England* concerning the Church and Scriptures (as you may ſee by the 8.19,20,21. Articles, and therefore it is not my Opinion) will appear not to be new, but agreeable to ancient Catholiques, in your own eſteem.

The firſt ſhall be Saint *Irenæus*. Have you appealed to Saint *Irenæus?* unto Saint *Irenæus* ſhall you goe. He in his

third book first chapter, first words thus; *We have not known the disposing of our salvation by any other then those by whom the Gospel came to us, which then indeed they preached, afterwards delivered it to us in the Scriptures, by the Will of God, to be the foundation and pillar of our Faith.* So he. Now that which is delivered in Scripture by the Will of God to be the foundation and pillar of Faith, is the ground and cause of our Faith. And such is the Gospel, according to this Testimony.

The next for us is *Clemens Alexandrinus*, in the seventh of his *Stromata*, towards the end, in the 757. *p.* of the *Greek* and *Latine* Edition. *He which is to be believed by himself, reasonably is worthy to be believed by the Lords Scripture and Voice, working by the Lord, inwardly to the benefit of men.* So he. Then according to him, the Holy Scripture is not worthy to be beleeved by men, but men are worthy of beleef by it. And therefore that must ground our Faith, because it is it whereby we beleeve others. And therefore he saith in the following words, *Surely we use it as the Criterium for finding out of things.* And therefore points are to be decided and determined by authority of it; which is his chief discourse against Heretiques even to the end of that book. And if you please to peruse and consider it, you shall find there that in his judgement the Catholique Church (which he also there commends) doth not conserve it self in that denomination by its own authority, but by the Rule of Scripture. Now that which rules the whole rules the parts; the Scripture rules the whole, then us.

So *Origen* upon Saint *Matthew*, *Hom.* 25. *We ought not therefore for confirmation of Doctrine to swear our own apprehensions, and to bring into witnesse those which every one of us doth understand and think to be according to Truth, unless he shall shew them to be holy out of that which is contained in the Divine Scriptures, as in the certain Temples of God; what can be more to our purpose?* Then the Scripture is the Ground of Doctrines: then of Faith. As

As for *Athanaſius*, we need not his words, knowing his practice of holding the equality of the Divine Nature, in the ſecond Perſon, the Son of God, againſt all the World. Yet he ſpeaks, as he did, if you will look upon him about the Incarnation of the Word, at the latter end: *But thou having taken occaſion by theſe, if thou wilt read the Divine Books, and wilt apply thy minde to them, ſhalt learn out of them more plainly and more perfectly, the truth of what we have ſaid.* So he. Now where the Truth is learned more plainly and perfectly, there is the ground of Truth. In the Divine writings is the truth of thoſe things more plainly and more perfectly learned.

After the ſame manner doth *Tertullian* bring in his ſuffrage in his Book of Præſcriptions, a little after the beginning of it, thus, *Do we prove the Faith by the Perſons, or prove the Perſons by the Faith?* And again, *Faith conſiſts in the rule. You have the Law, and Salvation, by the obſervation of it.* And ſoon after, *To know nothing againſt the rule, is to know all things.* And again, *That which we are, the Scriptures were from the beginning, we are of them before it was otherwiſe, before they were corrupted by you.* So he, beſides other paſſages wherein he witneſſeth for us.

Saint *Ambroſe* giveth us alſo his voice, in his firſt Book to *Gratian*, chap. 4. in the beginning, thus, *But I will not that you believe an Argument, O holy Emperour, and our diſputation; let us ask the Scripture, let us ask the Apoſtles, let us ask the Prophets.* Then we are to be determined in our Belief by the Scriptures.

Saint *Cyprian* alſo, (who for order of time ſhould have been put before) gives his verdict for us, in the beginning of his ſixth Sermon, concerning the Lords Prayer, thus, *The Evangelical Precepts, moſt beloved Brethren, are nothing elſe but the Divine Magiſteries, the foundations of building, our Hope, the firmaments of corroborating our Faith, the nutriments of chearing our heart, the Gubernacles of directing our journey, the ſafegards of obtaining Salvation, which, while they do*

*inſtruct the Docile minds of Believers upon Earth, bring them to the Kingdome of Heaven.* So the Father. Where you ſee the Scriptures are aſſerted immediately to be the Ground and Firmament of Faith.

Yea, neither doth Saint *Auſtin* ſeem to ſpeak onely for your cauſe. In the ſeventh Tome, in the third Chapter of the *Unity of the Church*, againſt the Epiſtle of *Petilianus*, in the beginning he hath theſe words, *But as I began to ſay, let us not hear theſe things I ſay, theſe things thou ſayeſt, but let us hear theſe things the Lord ſaith. There are certainly the Books of the Lord, whoſe authority we both conſent unto, we both believe, we both are obedient to; there let us ſeek our Church, there let us diſcuſſe our cauſe.* And ſoon after, *Let theſe things be taken out of your way, which againſt one another we recite not out of the Divine Canonical books, but otherwiſe.* And ſoon after, *Some may ask why I would have theſe things taken out of the way, ſince if they be brought forth, your Communion is invincible*; (he anſwers) *becauſe I would not have the Church demonſtrated by Humane Documents, but by Divine Oracles*: and ſo to the end of the Chapter, which he concludes thus; *therefore let us ſeek it* (the Church) *in the Holy Canonical Scriptures.*

I have now made good my words, to give you Catholick Teſtimonies on our ſide. Amongſt which Saint *Auſtins* authority gives advantage to plant Arguments upon: thus:

If in buſineſſes of diſpute we muſt hear what the Lord ſaith, not what man ſaith, then the Scripture is the ground, not humane authority.

But let us not hear what I ſay or thou ſaiſt (ſaith the Father) but what the Lord ſaith. Again, Where we muſt ſeek the Church, there we muſt reſolve our Faith. But we muſt ſeek the Church in the Scriptures, as the Father ſaith. If the Church is to be proved by the Scriptures, then the Scriptures are the ground of Faith, becauſe they are the ground of the Church: there is no reſolution of

Faith

Faith but in that which is indemonstrable; therefore not in the Church, because that is demonstrated by the Scriptures, as he saith. Again, Divine Oracles are the ground of Faith: the Scriptures are the Divine Oracles, as he saith, as the Scripture saith, as Saint Ignatius saith, in his Epistle to the Church of Smyrna. Indeed the proper object of Faith Catholick is the Word of God, not the Word of Man. And proportionably the cause of this Faith, must be divine authority, not any authority of Man. As demonstrative reason makes Science, so humane authority makes Opinion: but Faith is an assent to that which is spoken by God as true, because he speaketh it: therefore the authority of the Church is not a meanes apt to beget Faith, because it is of another kinde, and cannot exceed the nature of humane authority, although it be the highest in the kinde, if it be represented in a lawful General Council. Yet even General Councils have erred, and therefore they cannot be the Ground of Faith. This is the prerogative of the Canonical books, as the Father and all Antiquity calleth them: but never did we hear of a Canonical Church. The Scripture is the Canon, is the rule, not the Church. The Church witnesseth Truth, The Church keepeth Truth. The Church defendeth Truth. The Church Representative in a Council, determineth Controversies authoritatively, not infallibly, and therefore bindes not unto Faith, but to Peace: not to Faith in the Conscience, but to Peace in the Church; not affirmatively, that we should say it is true, because they say it; but negatively, that we should not rashly oppose it, as false, because they define it as true. Hitherto we go for the honour of the Church Catholick, not Roman. And now I have given you some reason of our Faith.

It followes now in your Reply; or indeed how can I account him a Catholick (without a palpable contradiction) that doth not believe the Catholick Church.

*Answ.* I say so too. But what from thence? To pro-

fesse

ſelle a belief that there is a Catholique Church (whereof part is triumphant in Heaven, part on Earth expectant) and to profeſſe my ſelf to belong to the Catholique Church, is not incluſive of your ſenſe, that the Catholique Church is the ground of our belief. We believe the Catholique Church grounded in the Scripture, or built upon the foundation of the Apoſtles and Prophets, Jeſus Chriſt himſelf being the chief Corner Stone, as Saint *Paul* ſpeaks, *Epheſ.* 2. 20.

Secondly, This is not to your purpoſe, becauſe the Catholique Church, as it is an object of Belief, muſt be conſidered as inviſible; whereas you intend the Church as viſible, whoſe propoſals we muſt receive and ſubmit our underſtanding unto. For the Inviſible Church, or Church as Inviſible, cannot order us in our Belief, becauſe, as ſuch, it is not known to us.

I come now to your Teſtimonies.

And your firſt witneſſe is Saint *Irenæus.*

*Anſw.* We yeild all to Saint *Irenæus*, nothing to you. We ſay, we ought not to ſeek amongſt others the truth, which we may eaſily take and receive from the Church, &c. Yes, becauſe the Church is ſerviceable to the truth, by way of Miniſtery to deliver the Word of Truth, to keep the Word of Truth, to uphold the Word of Truth. And ſo we acknowledge the Church to be a ſufficient Treaſury of Truth, becauſe we have therein the Scriptures. But the Treaſury doth not make the Money true nor currant: for it is poſſible that there may be falſe Money in the Treaſury. Therefore we muſt not take it to be lawfull, becauſe it cometh out from thence: and ſo the Scripture is not made true to us, or the ſenſe of it evidently credible to us, becauſe it is in the Church. But we muſt look whoſe Image and Superſcription the Doctrine hath, and whether it be right coyn or not, and it may ſeem to be of the right ſtamp and yet not. Therefore ſaith *Origen* in his 34. *Hom.* upon *Matth. All Money*, 1. Every word that hath

hath the Royal ſtamp of God, and the Image of his Word upon it, is lawful. Therefore we muſt bring it to the Word for trial. We confeſſe we may take out of her the drink of Life; yea, but not out of a ciſtern, ſuch water as cometh from the Fountain, the Scripture; and we drink out of the Scripture the Water of Life, as *Tertullian* in his Preſcriptions. We deny not this to be the entrance of Life, becauſe we have here the means of grace adminiſtred.

And all without the Church we ſay are thieves and robbers, and they ought to be avoyded. Yes, All without the boſome of the Catholick Church, which would break her Peace, and rob her Treaſury, are as thieves and robbers, and ought to be avoyded. We grant that thoſe things which are of the Church, as being true from Scripture, in points of faith; or not repugnant to Scripture in things of Diſcipline, are with great diligence to be loved. And we allow it, that the tradition of Truth is to be received. Yes, thus, the tradition of Scripture, the word of Truth, or the Truth delivered in writing; for ſo Tradition not ſeldome ſignifieth. Or tradition of Truth, which is according to Scripture, as the Apoſtles Creed. Not that whatſoever is delivered ſhould be Truth, (as you would have it) but whatſoever Truth is delivered, ſhould be received. This is all that place as ſeemeth to me will afford.

Your ſecond Teſtimony from the ſame Father, may it ſelf anſwer the Objection of the former, and may confirm my anſwer. Onely let me adde that he ſpeaketh of the Church then purer then now. If you will have more ſaid to this, you may find it in Saint *Cyprians* authority, which you produce next.

The Church (Catholick) alwayes holdeth, (not maketh) that which ſhe firſt knew. Where? in Scripture. Where elſe? And where the Church holds that which it thus knew, we hold with it, and are beholden to the Church for holding it forth to us. The Church may inform us of it; but it doth not certifie it to us: therefore

doth not infallibly conveigh it (the Truth) to us; therefore is not the ground of Faith. The Office of the Church is as a Candlestick to hold the Light of the Word of Truth. And moreover, though is did alwayes hold that which it knew, might it not also hold somewhat which she did not know? Though it did hold that which was true, might it not hold that which was false in other things? As the Church of *Rome* holds many things which are true (wherein we differ not) and also many things false, wherein she exceeds the Catholick Faith, as in regard of Object. Now put case therefore that that ancient Church near the Apostles times did not hold any point false, but did hold Every point true: yet even from hence nothing will be inferred sufficiently to your purpose, unless you can prove that it was appointed by God to be the ground of Faith by an impossibility of errour in any particular. Such is to be the ground of our Faith: which is wanting in the Church, not privatively, as if it had been ever promised; but Negatively, because not promised to the Church after the Apostles times. If it were possible that the Church might not erre, yet this would not make us rest our Faith in it. Faith hath no sure footing in such contingencies of Truth; unless you prove a non-possibility of erring, you doe nothing.

But we come now to the signal testimony of this kind, that of Saint *Austin*, I would not beleeve the Gospel, unless the authority of the Church did move me.

To which I answer, First, if the testimonies of the other Fathers be defective in clearness or fulness as to this matter, the testimony of one single Father (though excellent) will not amount to the Verdict of the whole Church: and you have no Fathers yet for you, for any thing I see.

Secondly, Take this passage by it self, and it seems to speak high, but consider it with the tenour of his discourse in the whole chapter, and it is like you will begin to think

think that it comes out from him in ſome heat of ſpirit to overcome his adverſary.

Thirdly, you will be pleaſed to give me leave to uſe a *Criticiſme*, which admitted according to the reaſonableneſſe of it, will ſomewhat change the property of this ſuffrage. It appeareth by compare of places in *African* writers, that (as is obſerved) their manner was to expreſſe the tenſe more then paſt by the imperfect; and alſo that he in other places muſt ſo be underſtood. And if ſo here, then it muſt refer to him as when he was a Manichee; he was moved then, as ſuch, by the authority of the Church to the embracing of the Goſpel. And ſo we grant that the authority of the Church doth move to beleeve the Scriptures. But this cometh not to the caſe in hand, which is intended for particular points of faith, whether we ſhould ground our faith of them in the Scripture, and not in the propoſal of the Church. Neither is this an univerſal way (as is pretended) of coming to the beleef of the Scriptures by the commendation of the Church: for ſome have been added to the Church immediately from the word, as in the ſecond of the *Acts*, at the preaching of Saint *Peter*; as is noted.

And yet fourthly, mark the terms. It is not ſaid I would not believe the Goſpel unleſſe the authority of the Church did cauſe me, but unleſſe the authority of the Church did move me. And thus this Teſtimony doth very well agree with our Opinion. The authority of the Church might move him, although he did ground his Faith in the Goſpel. And this is illuſtrated by the *Samaritanes* beleeving Chriſt through the teſtimony of the woman; but when they came to Chriſt and ſaw him, *They ſaid unto the woman, we believe no more for thy ſaying, for we have heard and ſeen that he indeed is the Saviour of the world, the Chriſt*, John 4. 42. So Saint *Auſtin* might be moved by the voyce of the Church to give an ear to the Truth of the Goſpel, and yet was ſettled in the Beleef of it from its ſelf by the Spirit

of God. When he did beleeve the immediate cauſe of his Divine Faith was from the Goſpel by the Spirit of God; although before he did beleeve, he was moved to think well of the Goſpel by the authority of the Church. So he did not belive the Goſpel by the authority of the Church, as a Theological principle, but as an outward mean and help thereunto. For the authority of the Church could not by its teſtimony of the Goſpel make it properly credible, becauſe the teſtimony of the Church is to be made true by it. And if it be not true in it ſelf, then the teſtimony is falſe. So that before we know whether the Goſpel be true, we know not whether the teſtimony of the Church be true. As alſo we cannot tell how to beleeve that the Church ſhould alwayes give a true teſtimony (as you ſuppoſe) in every point, but by the Scripture. And therefore there is no ground or reſt for Faith, but in the Scripture. Since, if we beleeve the Church becauſe the Scripture gives teſtimony of it, and then the Scripture becauſe the Church gives teſtimony thereof, we muſt firſt beleeve the Scripture before we beleeve the Church. Therefore we muſt terminate our Faith in the Scripture, and if we do beleeve it, beleeve it for it ſelf; it being the firſt credible.

Fifthly, Look to the end of that chapter, and there, after he had diſputed ſubtilly, he doth conclude ſoberly, But God forbid that I ſhould not beleeve the Goſpel, and then concludes againſt his Adverſary from thence, (as the rule of the difference betwixt them) for, Beleeving that (ſaith he) I do not find how to beleeve you, *&c.* And that the Scripture is the Rule he went by, you may ſee in his 32. chapter againſt *Creſconius*, whether let me if you pleaſe refer you for brevitie. *None can overcome S.* Auſtin, *but S.* Auſtin.

And therefore I need not ſay any thing to the ſecond teſtimony, which is taken out of him againſt *Creſconius*. Yet obſerve, Although of this there is no example certainly brought forth out of the canonical Scriptures, yet alſo we keep the Truth of the Holy Scriptures, in this when we

do

do that which hath pleased the whole Church, saith he, Namely in that which is not a ruled case in Scripture, as the question was about the Truth of the Baptisme of Heretickes, It seems then, if it had been determined in Scripture there had been an end of it, that because the Holy Scripture cannot deceive, saith he: And this property absolute belongs to it, not to humanitie. Whosoever doth fear to be deceived by the obscurity of the Question, may ask counsel touching it of the Church, whom without doubt the Scripture it self, doth shew, saith he. First here is an obscure question about practice: so are not all points. Some are clear in Scripture, and yet the Proposition is universal, that we must believe every thing by the proposal of the Church, as if we must beleeve nothing but what the Church defineth: and whatsoever it doth define, that we must beleeve.

Secondly, We should ask counsel onely, which doth not suppose an absolute determination.

Thirdly, (which Church) the Scripture doth without doubt shew; then the Church is to be proved by Scripture again. And without doubt doth shew, but doth not shew to be alwayes without doubt, and infallible.

Fourthly, he afterwards goeth about to prove it against him by testimonies out of Scripture.

But, behold, yet again in a third Testimony of Saint *Austin*, *No peaceable man will be against the Church.*

*Answer*, Saint *Austin* is again welcome, I say so too, and shall anon end with the whole Sentence.

And yet once more in a fourth Testimony, Saint *Austin*. It is of most insolent madness to dispute against that which the whole Church holdeth.

We answer, We say so too, in things of indifferency, which every particular Church hath power in for it self, and the Catholicke Church for all. And yet all Catholick practices are not now observed by the Church of *Rome*, as for one, Infant Communion. But according to the Father, if

the

the Authority of the Scripture doth preſcribe, which of theſe is to be done, it is not to be doubted that we ſhould do ſo as we read. In ſuch things then which are defined by Scripture, we know what we ſhould do intuitively to Scripture, without asking counſel of the Church. As certainly I may believe that Jeſus is the Chriſt, that he that believeth ſhall be ſaved, immediately out of Scripture, and not upon the Churches propoſal.

And now I have delivered you from your fear of my rejecting the Fathers. Surely we ſhould love the Fathers though they were our Enemies, and we have no reaſon to fear them when they are our Friends. Therefore, if you pleaſe to give me leave ſo far, let me ſay as *Nilus* the Archbiſhop of *Theſſalonica* (as the Book bears title) ſaid, (in his firſt Book about the Primacy of the Pope, or the difference between the Greek and Latin Churches) It is very unreaſonable that you who have not the Fathers for your examples, ſhould of your ſelves underſtand that which is better, and we who have the Fathers ſhould not.

Afterwards, in your Reply, you come to upbraid me with Devotion to modern men. But this Belief of yours concerning me is not well grounded: we delight not our ſelves in being Servants to Men in matters of Faith. What is true we like in any, what is not true, we do not like in any. In Divine writings we take all, for there we conſider not ſo much what is ſaid, as who ſaith: in Humane Writings we pick, for we conſider not who ſpeaketh, but what is ſaid agreeable to the Scriptures. Therefore with them we deal, as Saint *Auſtin* with Saint *Cyprians* authority, in the forenamed chapter againſt *Creſc.* What we find in them which is agreeable to the Canonical Scripture, we receive with commendation, what doth not, with their leaves we leave.

But to make as ſhort work with them as I can, I anſwer, firſt,

first, as many testimonies and more clear might be found in them against you, I hope if those testimonies be for you, let one be set against the other. And if you say I should be moved by them, because they are ours I answer. Secondly, If they agree with the sense of the Fathers, you cannot condemn them: if they do not agree, we do. Thirdly, It is possible to be Even with you in the same kind, by a retaliation of *Pontificians* against you: But Fourthly, I could finde in my heart not to say a word to them, that you might see I do not give them that respect, as to the Fathers. And yet, take the strength of all their authorities together, and make of them an accumulative argument (as we may speak) yet they do not conclude your cause. *Calvin* and his Schollar, in their sayings, affirm no more then that which we acknowledge (not from them) that the Church shall by the assistance of the Spirit, be sufficiently furnished with necessary Doctrine unto Salvation, but those of the Church invisible may be saved, though the Church visible be not Infallible, and by consequence not the ground of Faith.

As for Doctor *Saravia's* passage, I answer, it doth not come up close to your purpose. The *H. G.* which beareth rule in the Church (objectively) is the true Interpreter of Scripture: and thus it is not for you. And if you understand the Church (objectively) yet first the matter he seems to speak to, is of Discipline about Government of the Church, depending upon Primitive Example: but we are upon points of Faith. Secondly, He cannot be contrary to himselfe, when he acts as he did formerly in the time of the Apostles: but whether he doth so act now is a question, yea no question. Thirdly, If you will with him, and from him, draw the Government of the Church to be proportionably Episcopal, with all my heart. I reject them that reject it.

And your Adversaries of *Wittenberg* confesse nothing for you. The rule (they speak of) namely Prophetical, and

and Apostolical preaching, &c. it is the Word of God written, according to which she is bound to interpret those places which are obscure, and to judge of Doctrines, according to the rule which she hath received, so as her Interpretations are to be agreeable to the analogy of Faith, and her judgements of Doctrines to be made according to the Law of the Word: namely, harder places are to be expounded by those which are more plain, and Controversies to be decided by that rule. And all this makes nothing for you. For thus the Scripture is the Rule ruling, and the Church is but the Rule ruled. And thus we follow the Church as the Church followes the rule, as Saint *Paul* saith, *Be ye followers of me as I am of Christ*, in the first Epistle to the *Corinthians*, c. 11. v. 1. Or if those *Lutherans* mean by a certain rule any rule distinguished from Scripture, it is to be understood of some general heads of Christian Doctrine, in proportion whereunto, doubtfull places and Doctrines were to be judged. But those heads were to be gathered out of Scripture. And so all is resolved towards belief in Scripture, but I think no man can see how they should say such a rule, which was not Scripture, was confirmed by miracles. So for them.

And for Doctor *Field*, if you will go through the twentieth chapter of the fourth Book, you shall finde nothing in him contrary to this Doctrine. For he saith plainly, that though the Canonical Books are received by way of Tradition, yet the Scriptures have not their authority from the approbation of the Church, but they win credit of themselves, and yeild satisfaction to all men of their Divine Truth; whence we judge that the Church which receiveth them, is led by the Spirit of God. Observe, not because the Church is led by the Spirit of God, therefore doth he say she receiveth them, but because she receiveth them, therefore we judge she is led by the Spirit of God. And

as

as for his Rule of Faith deſcending by Tradition from the Apoſtles, what is he like to mean but *the Apoſtles Creed*, which he ſaith there, was delivered in the Church as a Rule of her Faith? But even this binds not by authority of the Church, or upon Vertue of Tradition, but by proportion to Scripture, where it is found in particulars of matter, though not in form of a Creed. We confeſſe alſo that we ſhould ſearch out the true Church, as the ſame Doctour ſaith. We confeſſe that the Catholick Church is the Houſhold of Faith, the Spouſe of Chriſt, the Church of the Living God; and that we ſhould embrace her Communion, and reſt in her judgement. Yes, but how? Not ultimately, not abſolutely, not in what ſo ever ſhe ſaith, becauſe ſhee ſaith it: but in what ſo ever ſhee ſaith from the Lord. For although ſhe doth goe by an infallible Rule, yet are we not ſure ſhe goeth by it infallibly. Therefore, though wee reſt in her judgements as to Peace, yet can wee not reſt in her judgements as to Truth: becauſe our underſtandings are not free to aſſent to what man will; as being bound to aſſent to that onely which is grounded in the Word of God in matters of Faith.

And now might I Vie with you in number of Pontificians againſt you. See *Durand* in his Prologue upon the Sentences, where he hath more to our purpoſe then is neceſſary to be Tranſcribed. Read him your ſelf: *Gerſon* alſo in his Sermon concerning Errours againſt Faith and Manners about the Precept, *Thou ſhalt not kill*; ſaith thus, *More freely, more purely, more truely, more ſpeedily is Truth found out, and Errour reproved, if the Divine Law alone be conſtituted as Judge, according to the conſideration of* Ariſtotle; *He which makes the Law the Judge, makes God: but he that addes Man, addes a Beaſt.* Panormitanus alſo upon the 5. of the *Decret.* concern-

ing almes in chap. *qualiter & quando*, *The saying of any Saint established with the Authorities of the New or Old Testament is preferred before a Papal Constitution, even in decision of Causes.* Also *Ferus* upon the 1 *Epistle* of Saint *John*, 2. chapter in the 523. page of the *Antwerpe* Edition, thus; *The Holy Ghost doth teach us by the means of the Holy Scripture and Word.* Again, *The Holy Scripture is given to us as a certain sure Rule of Christian Doctrine.* And again in the same page, *For if having the Holy Scriptures as a most certain Rule of Christian Doctrine set before our Eyes, we notwithstanding, teach things so unlike, what would be done, if the Scriptures were taken away?* And if you say now that there is added to those places Tradition, in the *Roman* Edition after the *Trent Council*, as is noted; You will get nothing by that, but shame to the *Pontificians.*

And now, I think, I am not much behind hand with you in Testimonies about the Question.

But then afterwards you presse harder upon me. So you say; but I do not yet feel the weight of any thing you say. I beleeve the Creed, and that the Church is Holy. And I do not beleeve, but know that from hence nothing is coming to your cause. The Catholick Church makes not it self the ground of Faith, but is grounded in it as before. And how were the first Members of the Catholick Church made Christians, but by the Word of God? And from the Holyness of it doth not follow infallibility by the *Roman* distinction which saith that the Pope may erre, as to his own person, but not in matters of Faith as to the Church.

I beleeve that the Church is the Spouse of Christ, and that she is without spot or wrinkle, or any such thing, as to that part which is in Heaven, and that the other part of the Church as invisible which is not yet in Heaven shall be without spot or wrinkle, or any such thing, when it cometh up to Heaven. But I do not beleeve that that Text is meant

of

of the Church visible. For all here glorious, or none: not all glorious here, therefore none. For you find it in the Text, that it is to be presented as a glorious Church, namely as in the whole. But you will not say, that every Member of the visible Church is here glorious without spot, without wrinkle or any such thing.

If you do say so, you contradict *Bellarmin* in his third Book *of the Militant Church*, the second chapter, who there includes *in his Definition of the Church visible*, even Reprobates wicked and ungodly men; and requires there no internal virtue for the constitution of a Member of the Church, but onely an external profession of Faith, and communion of Sacraments. And besides you know glory, which is a perfection of Grace, doth not belong to the way, but the Country in Heaven. And besides, if you will not beleeve me in such an Exposition, beleeve your *Estius*; who with * Saint *Austin*, understands it, upon good Reason of the Church invisible; as you may see in *Estius* Comment upon the place. And here by the way we have another Testimony of your own against you, if you account your Argument from this Text sufficient to your cause. And we have St. *Austins* authority to boot, as *Estius* quotes him. And moreover Holyness is no formal principle of our direction, especially in points of Faith. It is Holy because it follows, and as it follows the Rule, and so should we in faith and manners. And therefore if it were to be understood of the Visible Church (as it is not) yet you conclude nothing for your turn upon this consideration.

* In his *Retractations*, p. 9. *Ed. Frob.* but this Quotation not added in my copy to him.

To hasten, the next Text is formerly urged, *the Church the Pillar and Ground of Truth.* Yet squeeze it, and presse it, and make the best use of it you can, it will not afford your inference you would make from it.

For first, some, and also very reasonably, will refer this Expression not to the Church, but to the Mystery of God-

lineſſe which ſallows; and ſo they make it as an *Hebrew* form of ſetting out ſome high point and grand Doctrine; and then it goes thus; *A Pillar and Ground of Truth, and without Controverſie, a great Myſtery of Godlineſs is this,* (namely) *God manifeſted in the fleſh*, &c. If ſo, your intereſſe in it is ſunk, and indeed the copulative, [And] *and without Controverſie*) doth not ſeem ſo well and ſo cloſe to knit elſe. But it being given, not granted, that that *Criticiſme* is not ſufficient, what of all that? For Saint *Irenæus*, as before, gives this Eulogy to the Scripture. The Scripture gives it to the Church. Now to which doth this propertie belong firſt and abſolutely? To the Scripture or to the Church? Not to the Church, for the Church hath it from the Scripture. Now that which hath it firſt, hath its abſolutely, and independently upon that which follows; therefore the Scripture is the abſolute Pillar and ground of Truth. Then there Faith hath ſure footing; there it ſits down, there it reſts; on that Ground, upon that Pillar. The Church then hath this Title but ſubordinately; and what it ſaith cannot bind, but conditionately to that which is the abſolute Ground and Pillar of Truth For the Truth is the Pillar and Ground of the Church, as Saint *Chryſoſtome* ſaith upon the place.

Take it then of the Catholick Church (not *Roman*) The Text doth more ſet out the Office of the Church, then the authority. It doth hold, it doth propoſe, it doth uphold the Truth; but this doth not convince or evince, that whatſoever the Church doth hold, we ſhould alſo hold, and upon that account alſo; as if God had appointed the Church infallibly to conveigh to us whatſoever Truth; and nothing but Truth. And therefore may we and ought we to ſearch the Scriptures, as our Sav. our ſpeaks, *John* 5. 39. and by them *examine whatſoever the Church ſaith*, as thoſe of *Berea* did; that which

was

was said by Saint *Paul*, and they commended for it.

And therefore we cannot believe the Definitions of the Church upon its own word. Nay, can we also say, that God doth now give unto the Church such assistance, as then, which was noted before? and therefore we distinguish times, not thinking there should be as much said of the Church now, as when it included the Apostles; and therefore supposing that the Church then did hold all that was true, and nothing contrary; yet we cannot say it of the Church now, and therefore is not the cause of Faith, under whose authority it must also passe, beside the Divine Revelation to make it Catholique. For the Church is conserved by the Truth, as *Estius* also upon the place, then thus; where the ground of the Catholique Church is, there is the ground of Catholique Faith: The Scripture is the ground of the Catholique Church, unlesse it be conserved by some other principle then by which it is constituted. And it is conserved by the Truth, saith he, and thy word is Truth, saith our Saviour, *John* 17. 17. And whereas he sayes, that the Truth sustaineth the Church, and the Church sustaineth the Truth, and so one is the cause of the other; we answer, this is not available for you. For in the same kinde of cause it cannot be, for then we are in a circle, but the Truth sustains the Church, so as to continue it in its principles: the Church sustains the Truth but by way of ministery, which doth not make it to be a principle of Faith, no not to us.

Neither do the other Texts speak for you as you would have them. If the gates of Hell shall not prevail against the Church, it doth not follow that then Catholique Faith must be built upon the propositions

of the Church. Nothing shall prevail to the Condemnation of those, who belong to the Church of God, as invisible, and nothing shall prevail, not the Gates of Hell, against the Church visible, so as somewhere or other there shall not be some who shall professe the Christian Doctrine and Worship sufficiently to salvation.

The next Text speaks towards Excommunication, which comes little into the question: for the authority of the Church may proceed to Censure, although we be not bound, upon peril of want of Faith to submit our understandings to the definitions of the Church. As to the authority we may submit, so as to endure the censure, though we do not submit our judgements, as to believe the definitions.

As to the next place of Scripture, *Luke* 10. 16. We say first, this seems not to be rightly applyed to the businesse we are about, for this was directed not to the Governors of the Church, but to the seventy Disciples or Elders, which were sent by Christ to preach the VVord. Secondly, If you doe extend it to the Representative Church, yet doth it not command subjection of judgement alwayes, to whatsoever is said; but not to despise them, as is intimated by what followes, *and he that despiseth you, despiseth me.* VVe may differ without despising. And Thirdly, If you will from hence argue, that whatsoever was determined in a Council, was also determined by Christ, then *Honorius* was by Christ determined an Heretick, as you may see in the practicks of the sixth Oecumenical Synod, as *Nilus* in his second Book. And if you say that the Church cannot erre in a General Council, then resolve *Nilus* the reason why the Pope doth not hear a General Council; for if that General Council did not erre, (as by your argument it must

muſt not) then the Pope did erre. As for the other places of Holy Scripture, which you produce, of *Chriſts being with his Church to the end of the world, and of his promiſe of leading his Church into all truth*: VVe anſwer together.

Firſt, Though the promiſe be extendible to the end of the world, yet it is not neceſſary to underſtand it, ſo, as that there ſhall alwaies be equality of aſſiſtance to the times of the Apoſtles, which is hard to affirm, ſince we cannot ſay that there is ſuch neceſſity for ſuch aſſiſtance, or ſuch diſpoſitions in the Governours of the Church to receive ſuch aſſiſtance.

Secondly, The Promiſe is made good by a ſufficient direction of the Church to their end of happineſſe, although not without poſſibility of error. For every ſimple error doth not deprive the Church of Salvation, and then it may alſo recover it ſelf from errour, by more peruſal of the Scriptures. But if it may at all erre, it hath not the property of a ground of Faith, nor a juſt capacity of an Infallible communication of all things which are to be believed.

You go on. Now this Church, whoſe Authority is thus warranted, did precede the Scriptures.

*Anſw.* VVarranted, as a Church, but not as ſo, not as Infallible.

Did precede the Scriptures, which for a great part were written upon emergent occaſions, as you ſay.

*Anſw.* As for the writing of Scriptures, and the emergent occaſions, you may be further referred to Doctor *Field*, whom you made uſe of againſt me. VVhatſoever the occaſion was, the end was to make what was written a ſufficient rule of Faith and Manners.

ners. And as for your objection and inference upon it: VVe anſwer with a diſtinction; the Scripture is conſiderable two wayes, either in reſpect to the ſubſtance of Doctrine; or ſecondarily in reſpect to the manner of delivery by writing: in the firſt regard the Scripture did precede the Church; for the Church was begotten by it, which to them was as certain as the written to us. And if you could make your Traditions, of proper name, equally certain, you would ſay ſomewhat. And as for Scripture, that which is written doth binde, though it doth not properly binde, as written.

You ſay that the Church was called the Pillar and ground of Truth before it was written, and ſo you ſay might be ſaid of other paſſages.

We anſwer, As that place expreſſed it doth not appear to us that it was ſo called, ſince firſt we find it in termes, in Saint *Pauls* Epiſtle. But if ſo, or other like were uſed before; the anſwer before will ſerve.

By all which places the authority of the Church is commended to us, and we are referred to the Church as a Guide in all our Doubts. So you ſay, and ſo we ſay, Where is the Adverſary? How doth this conclude contradictorily? We confeſſe that the Authority of the Church is commended to us in Scripture; but not directly in every place you name; nor in any is it ſo commended to us as to ground our Faith. We confeſſe we are referred to the Miniſters for Direction; and to the Governours for juriſdiction, yet are not the Latter Maſters of our Faith, unto whom we ſhould be bound in a blind Obedience of Univerſal aſſent or practice. We take their advice, but we are not by them determined in our Faith. We may beleeve what they ſay, but not becauſe they ſay it. As it is drawn from

from Scripture, ſo it draweth us. If they make it probable that it is ſo, becauſe they ſay it: yet it hath not the certainty of Faith without the Word of God. I ſhould be very tender of incompliance with the judgement of the whole Church: but yet I muſt have for my warrant of Faith, the Lord ſaith, *And although there be no appeal from a General Councel, yet have they no infallible judgement.* You proceed, even the Scripture it ſelf is beleeved upon the Tradition and authority of the Church.

*Anſwer*, This was touched before in the caſe of Saint *Auſtin*, and it is in effect anſwered, as before, by Doctor *Field*.

Indeed we take the Canonical Books by Tradition from the Church: but we doe not take them to be Canonical by Tradition from the Church. The authority of the Church moves me as to the Negative not to diſſent: but aſſent is ſettled to them as ſuch in the way of Faith, becauſe they are ſuch. *In thy Light we ſhall ſee Light*, as the Pſalmiſt ſpeaks, *Pſalm* 36. 9. or *by thy Light*; ſo *by Scripture we ſee Scripture*.

Next follows the Expoſtulation, which may be put into this diſcourſe; Either we ground our beleef upon the Church, or upon our own fancy and private Interpretation of Scripture, *&c.*

*Anſwer*, We deny your disjunction. We ground our beleef, neither upon the authority of the Church as you; nor upon fancy, neither as ſome have done who have been better friends to *Romans*, then they have been to us, as Doctour *Whitaker* told *Campian* upon a like imputation of *Anabaptiſtical* fancies.

We differ from you, becauſe we allow to private Chriſtians a judgement of diſcretion, or diſcerning, which ſure is commended in that precept, *Prove all things*, in the firſt Epiſtle to the *Theſſalonians* 5. 21. We

differ from those who magnifie their private interpretations, because we say they should be directed by their Ministers, and ordered by the Bishops; the Pastours of the Church, chiefly, when they are assembled in a General Council, wherein is the highest power of Oyer and Terminer as we may speak, of hearing and ending differences in the Church; yet we cannot say that we are absolutely bound unto their Canons, we having the judgement of private discretion, and they not the judgement of Infallibility. And if you cannot say that they are absolutely without any doubt, but true; without doubt we can say that we should not absolutely beleeve them. Every possible defect of certainty in the Object excludes Faith; the certainty whereof admits no falsity. Therefore can we not presently yeeld or assent to whatsoever is by them defined, because they may erre. As it was said of the *Athenians*, they were not fools, but they could doe foolish things: So though they be learned men, though great Divines, yet may they possibly propose that which is not so. They reason points by the Scripture: which was wont as is noted) to be laid in the middle, (when they were in Council,) but since they goe to discourse from Scripture in things doubtful, and doe not see all Conclusions in principles of Scripture by way of Intelligence; it is possible for them not rightly to apply some principles of Scripture to some particular cases. Therefore since they have not a power not to erre, we have a power to suspend our Faith; nay we cannot give it without evidence of Truth. Yet since they have a power to order us, we have a Duty not to oppose or disturb. And thus this Doctrine makes way for Faith, not for Heresie; since we may differ from the Opinions of the Church, even defined, and yet not be Hereticks; because the formality of the Heretick hath it self in the will,

will, and wilful blindneſſe is more apt to make Hereticks then a ſober diſquiſition, which would know what it doth beleeve. For Beleef is not divided againſt Knowledge, but Science.

Whereas you ſay afterwards in your Reply, that the Scripture is the Rule of Faith and Manners, and the Church the ground of our beleef nevertheleſſe;

I anſwer, I am very glad you confeſſe that the Scripture is the Rule of Faith and Manners. But this confeſſion will deſtroy your Poſition, that the Church is the ground of our beleef, in your ſenſe. For if that be our Rule Ruling, then our beleef is to be ruled by that. For as *Clemens Alexandrinus* in the 7. of his *Stromata*, ſaith in this matter, *That Principle which needs another Principle, is not a Principle*: ſo that Rule which needs another Rule, how is it a Rule? Is it an adæquate Rule or not? If ſo, then where are your Traditions? If not, how a Rule of Faith and Manners; Is it ſufficient or not? If ſufficient, then what neceſſity of your Propoſal of the Church, eſpecially for things neceſſary which are plain? If not ſufficient: then how a Rule of Faith and Manners? And if both the Scripture and the Church be both Grounds of beleef, then either coordinate or ſubordinate. Not coordinate, for then the voyce of the Church muſt be equal to the VVord of God, without the VVord of God: and who then will be guilty of the phanatical Spirit? If ſubordinate, then the principal ground makes the reſt of Faith. And when I know Gods Revelation in Scripture, what need I goe to the Church for authority or Interpretation? And beſides where there is need of Interpretation, although it doth belong to the Church to interpret, yet cannot we ground a beleef in that interpretation, unleſſe it did appear that the Church doth interpret infallibly: But this is not yet proved; & therfore your reaſon is not valid. And if you ſay

the Church cannot erre, becauſe it goeth by the expoſitions of the antient Fathers, do but conſider how hardly we can ſettle and fixe belief therein. For who hath read them all? yea, how few know them all? and who knowes whether he that doth know them and hath read them all, doth give us a right account of them? who can exactly diſtinguiſh betwixt thoſe which are true, and thoſe which are falſe? who can accurately diſcern of the true Fathers, which pieces are true, which are foiſted in? who can perfectly judge all their idioms of ſpeech? who can reconcile the differences betwixt one and another? yea, who can compoſe the differences betwixt themſelves?

And that Text which you produce of Saint *Peter*, will do you no good, for we do not magnifie private interpretations. We ſay private men ſhould adviſe with the Church: but are we ſure that ſhe hath hit the right ſenſe?

But as for the Text, it is impertinently produced, if it be rightly interpreted, No Prophecy of Scripture is of private Declaration; and to this effect the Syriack: No Prophetical ſolution is of private writing, was not written by a private ſpirit, for ſo it beſt agrees with that which followes in the laſt verſe: for Prophecy was not brought to us at any time by the will of Man, &c. And after the ſame manner doth *Cajetan* comment upon the place; he toucheth the difference between Sciences written, and Prophecies written, in this regard, that a Learned Man teacheth and writeth according to his own Interpretation, thoſe things which do appear in the light of his Agent intellect, but the Prophet doth ſay and write thoſe things which appear under the light of Divine Revelation, not according to the interpretation of his own judgment. So he. So then the Text relates to thoſe who wrote Scripture, not to thoſe who ſhould interpret

terpret it, being written. And besides, when private Mendo interpret Scripture for themselves, they are not to interpret it by private meanes, but by it self, comparing place with place, and discerning the sense of that which is obscure, by that which is more plain. And if it be a passage that is very obscure, and there be no other passage more clear to illustrate it, it is not like to be a point, without the belief whereof there is no Salvation. Well said the Greek *Nilus*, to accuse the Scripture is all one, as if one should accuse God, but God is without blame.

It followes in your Reply, and all this spoken here, and in the position, &c. of the Church, is meant of such a Church as doth truly deserve the name of Catholique.

*Answ.* This I said enough to at the beginning. But you seem to be very loath to own the Church of *Rome*, and to avouch her, and yet you would seem to manage the point, which they make much of, as they: as if you had some minde to be a true Catholique abstractedly from *Rome*, and so indeed you may be in the antient sense, as they used it for those who were Orthodoxal. Yet for what Church you reserve those great titles, and what Church, in your esteem, doth deserve the name of Catholique, I know not. You are very close in this. But let me now at least conclude, that if the Catholique Church be not the ground of Faith in your sense, surely the *Roman* is not.

And now all that I have to do, is to justifie two expressions of mine, which you are pleased to carp at.

The one is, that I said the *Pontificians* do hold the proposal of the Church of *Rome* to be the formal object of their faith. You say that you must assure the answerer that the *Pontificians* do not make the Church of *Rome* (in its

proposal, to be the formal object of their Faith (as he doth impose upon them) for that they acknowledge to be the Revelation of God, or the authority of God revealing, which causes their Belief to be supernatural or Divine, &c.

*Answ.* I am glad my expression gave you occasion thus to expresse your self. See how you now differ from your selfe. Before, the ground of believing was the authority of the Church; now the authority of God revealing the cause of their belief. Before you concluded, Faith consisted in submitting the understanding, and adhering to the Church, and in believing every thing, because she proposeth it; now it is the authority of God revealing, which causes their faith to be Divine. As for the term, thus; the formal object is such, under which, and in respect wherevnto, any thing proceedeth; if then Gods Revelation cometh not to us under the Proposal of the Church, or as proposed by the Church, then the cause is lost; if it doth, then grant me my term, and affirm with me that the Pontificians hold so. If not, they are better then you. And what means else their implicite faith, unlesse we are to believe every thing as the Church believeth it (and because the Church proposeth it as you said) and if we be to beleive every thing as the Church believeth it, then is the Church the formal object of their faith; since they are also bound not to doubt, but simply to obey, as *Bellarmine* tells us in his fourth Book of the Roman Bishop, 5. chap.

The other term you find fault with is, excesse of faith, You taxe it as improperly spoken: But surely it will passe without any Grain of Salt or of allowance, if we consider that Faith may be compared as to a particular object, and so there is not an Excesse of Faith as to that: but then it may be compared as to many objects, and so, though we do not more believe one thing then

we ſhould, if we ſhould indeed believe it, yet may we believe where there are ſhould be no believe more things, which are not at all to be believed. And thus, if we ſhould believe whatſoever the Church of *Rome* propoſeth, we might be deſtroyed for exceſſe of Faith. The Church of *Rome* is peccant in exceſſe of Faith by believing more points than it ſhould believe, and this is the reaſon why our Divinity is in negatives, as to differences with them, becauſe their Divinity in differences to us, is in additions.

SIR, If you will excuſe me for being ſo long, I ſhall now conclude with the whole concluſion of Saint *Auſtin*, whereof you gave me but part. *Againſt Reaſon no Sober Man will go, againſt Scriptures no Chriſtian,* (then Chriſtians ſhould go by Scriptures) *againſt the Church no Peace-maker.*

THE Romane Catholicks have often foretold, that by permitting freely to all ſorts of people whatſoever, the reading of the Scriptures in their Mother Tongue, multitudes of New Sects and Hereſies would not fail to grow up in numberleſs Number; and as for the Peoples Manners, they would daily grow worſe and worſe. How true this is, let the world judge. That then which now mainly imports, is to diſtinguiſh the true Religion from ſo many falſe ones. This is my Aim. To effect this, I did write a ſhort Paper, ſhewing the Catholick Church to be the infallible way to Salvation (which is to be obtained only in the next world) that we cannot have as things ſtand, any other Aſſurance to ground our Faith upon ſecurely. I did never deny, that when by the Infallible Authority of the Church we are aſſured that the Scriptures be the word of God we can-

not

The

# The Roman Catholick's first Treatise.

*How in these times in which there be so many Religions, the true Religion may certainly be found out.*

## The Preface.

THE Romane Catholicks have often foretold, that by permitting freely to all sorts of people whatsoever, the reading of the Scriptures in their Mother Tongue, multitudes of New Sects and Heresies would not fail to grow up in numberless Number; and as for the Peoples Manners, they would daily grow worse and worse. How true this is, let the world judge. That then which now mainly imports, is to distinguish the true Religion from so many false ones. This is my Aim. To effect this, I did write a short Paper, shewing the Catholick Church so to teach the infallible way to Salvation (which is to be obtained onely in the true faith) that we cannot have as things stand, any other Assurance to ground our faith upon securely. I did never deny, that when by the Infallible Authority of the Church we are secured that the Scriptures be the word of God we cannot

not believe such things as are clearly contained in the Scripture: for so I should deny that I could not believe that to be infallibly true, which upon an Infallible ground I believed to be Gods own word. But I did, and still do maintain, that no man can have Infallible ground to believe the Scriptures now, but he who first believeth that which the Church teacheth to be infallibly true. Whence it will follow, that his faith must needs now at the first be grounded upon the Revelation of Gods truth, made by God to us by his Church, and not by his written word.

The Papers I did write to this Effect have been answered by some truly Learned Scholar, so that I hope so worthy a Man will not reject such a Reply, as may seem to be as clear a Demonstration as any wise Man can hope for in this Matter. And such a Demonstration I hope (by Gods grace) to make, whilst I endevour to make good the Title prefixed to this Paper, which Title I now add, to shew that my chief drift is to guide a Soul redeemed by Christs blood, to that happy eternity, to which we cannot attain, unless in all doubtful Controversies of faith we follow the Catholick Church as an Infallible Judge in all those Controversies; we being obliged under pain of damnation not to dis-believe this Judge. And whilst I demonstrate this, I do demonstrate my former Position, *That the Infallible Authority of the Catholick Church is the Ground of our faith.* And also going on with this Demonstration, I will leave nothing of Concernment unanswered in the Reply made; and thus I will conclude contradictorily to the said Reply, which (a little after the beginning) denyeth, *The Authority of the Catholick Church to be the Ground of faith, and that whereby we are infallibly ascertained of the minde of God.* I answer not the Reply just in the Order that my Answer was returned, for so I should be over-long. I use this way of a little Treatise to prove my Title, for thus all will be more clear and less tedious. In the Conclusion I shew all the parts of the Reply to have been fully answered in this Discourse. 2.

## The Proof of the Title.

1. St. *Anselme* hath a very fit Similitude to expreſs how much a Contentious Spirit in diſputing doth blind the underſtanding from ſeeing the Manifeſt Truth. He ſayeth, that a little before Sun-riſing two men in the fields did fall into a hot debate concerning that place of the Heavens in which the Sun was that day to riſe, the one pointing out one part of the Heavens, the other another. They paſſed ſo far in their Contention, that falling together by the Ears, they both pulled out one anothers Eyes, and ſo when the Sun by and by after did riſe, neither of them both could ſee a thing ſo clear as was the place of the Sun riſing. To our purpoſe, Becauſe Zeal in Religion is accounted laudable, and alſo becauſe prejudice, cauſed by Education in ſuch or ſuch a Religion, is a thing exceedingly ſwaying us to our own ſide, we are commonly apt to grow into ſo hot a debate in diſputations about Religion, that I may freely ſay, This Paſſion hindreth many thouſands from ſeeing that clear Sun-ſhine of Truth, which men of mean Capacity would clearly behold, if ſetting all paſſion and prejudice aſide, they did with a Calm and humble Mind beg of God to give them this grace of ſeeking Truth with all ſincerity: for then he who ſhould ſeek, ſhould find.

2. This is proved manifeſtly and very comfortably for the vulgar ſort of leſs learned people (who make the greateſt Number of Souls in the world) by thoſe clear words of the Prophet *Eſay* (*c.* 35.) *Say to the faint-hearted, Take courage and fear not, behold God himſelf will come and ſave you: then ſhall the Eyes of the blind be opened, and the Ears of the deaf ſhall be opened, and there ſhall be a Path and a way, and it ſhall be called the Holy way, and this ſhall be unto you a direct way, ſo that fools cannot erre by it.* By this place it is evidently proved, that the way which our Saviour at his coming would teach us, ſhould be not onely in it ſelf, but

but (as the Prophet saith) *shall be so a wonderful way, that fools cannot erre by it.* Let there arise never so many Controversies in Religion, let there spring up never so many Sects, yet the Promise of God will stand, that our Saviour at his coming should shew us *a holy way*, which should be unto us so direct a way that fools cannot erre by it. What *Holy way* is this? I say, It is the Holy Catholick Church, which even by this place is proved Infallible, *A way so direct unto us, that fools cannot erre by it.* But even wise men might erre by it, and by following it most faithfully, if this way could be fallible, and lead Men into Errours, and those damnable.

To our Purpose then; All Christians of whatsoever Religion they be, agree in this; That there must be One Judge of all Controversies and doubts, which either be or can be in Religion. The Reason is apparent, because otherwise every Man might be free to believe what he judged best, and so we should have as many Religions as there be Private and different Judgments. For if you in private, without all fault may follow your own Judgment (even after reading of Scripture,) and believe that to be true which out of Scriptures you think truest, why may not I, though I judge quite contrary to you, believe that also to be truest which I think to be true according to the Scriptures? Whence you see that Christ should have left a very Miserable Church, and should have gathered together a most heart-disunited sort of People, if after their reading of Scriptures, he had left them no other Judge but their own private Judgment. What Law-maker was ever so Inconsiderate, as to leave onely a Book of Laws to his Common-wealth, without any living Judge, to whose Judgment All were to submit? True it is, that to submit *exteriorly* to temporal Judges, is sufficient, they being able and onely to judge of the Exterior Man. But God who searcheth the Reines and the Heart, and who looketh most upon the Mind (which is the Seat of True

3.

or

a false belief ; doth chiefly consist ; that those of his Church be of One faith *Inclusively*, or else they be not of One faith ; for faith essentially consisteth in the *Interiour* Judgment. He hath all reason to exact they be of One faith ; for he could not seriously desire their Salvation, without he required of them to do that, which is so wholly Necessary to Salvation, that without it no man is saved : For *without faith it is impossible to please God* (Heb. 11. 6.) that is, It is impossible to please him without true faith ; for he is not pleased with false faith. But without we please God, it is impossible to be saved ; therefore without true faith (which consisteth in the *Interiour* Judgment) it is Impossible to be saved. And St. *Paul* (*Ephes.* 4. 5.) teacheth us, *that there is but one faith, one baptism, one God.* There being but One faith, and it being impossible to please God without this One faith, and all things necessary to please God being under Precept and of most strict Obligation, it followeth, that it is a Precept and a strict Obligation to have this faith, which chiefly and Essentially consisteth in the Interior Judgment. This I press so hard, because my Adversary hath a doctrine which I take to be exceedingly pernicious ; for he saith, (Pag. 28. Answ. 5.) *We say, They should be directed by their Ministers, and ordered by Bishops, the Pastors of the Church, chiefly when they are assembled in a General Council, wherein is the highest power of hearing and ending differences in the Church. Yet we cannot say, that we are absolutely bound to their Censure, we having the Judgment of private discretion, and they not the Judgment of Infallibility, and therefore since they have not a power not to err, we have a power to suspend our faith*, &c. By these and many other words used to this Effect, you see here *this Judgment of Private discretion* left free in the *interiour*, to hold what a Private person thinketh fit after perusal of the Scripture, although a whole General Council thinketh, and most unanimously defineth the Contrary, even after they

they have heard and most diligently weighed and pondered the same places of Scripture. Good God! is this the Promise of a *Holy way, that shall be to us a direct way, that fools cannot erre in it?* Yea, is not the wisest Man in the world most likely to erre in this way, by which he may in his Interior Judgment go quite Contrary to all Christendome? I know indeed that All who are not Roman Catholicks must say this: for if the Church is not Infallible Councel be fallible, then we cannot ground our faith upon that Councels definition. But even by this desperate Consequence, it is evident that God would give his Church an Infallible assistance, so to make good his Promise of leaving to them a *Holy way, which should be such to them, as that fools cannot erre therein.* For any Man of mean Capacity cannot erre, if he will submit his judgment to the Catholick Church: whereas any Man of never so great a Judgment, cannot but be highly suspected of Errour, and deeply guilty of exposing himself to manifest hazard of Erring in that faith, (without which it is Impossible to please God) when he doth not submit his Interior Judgment to the known unanimous Judgment of the whole Church. St. *Cyprian* was a Prime Doctor of the Church, and yet grounding himself upon that which he judged to be Scripture (as appeareth by his first Book Ep. 6. and other places) he did erre grosly about the necessity of Rebaptizing those who had been baptized by Hereticks. But saith St. *Austin* (l. 2. de Bapt. c. 4.) *If he had lived to see the determination of a Plenary Councel, he would, for his great Humility and Charity, straightway have yielded, and preferred the General Councel before his own Judgment.* Thus speaketh S. *Austin* of S. *Cyprian*, though he knew *his private Judgment of discretion* to be far less exposed in this Case to hazard of Erring, then is the *private Judgment of discretion of any private Man in the World*; especially when they go point-blank against a whole General Council in points of higher Concernment then

this point, in which St. Cyprian was pretendly ready to submit his Judgment. If then we will not be guilty of so intolerable a pride in overvaluing our own private Judgment of Discretion, with so manifest hazard of missing that, without which we cannot please God, or be saved; it then will highly concern us to enquire carefully after that *Way*, *which will be unto us a direct way*, *so that we shall not err by it*. For such a way our God hath promised us. Let us learn carefully after it.

4. This Promise of God had not been performed, and Christ his coming had but painfully provided for his Church, if he had not left it some certain Judge, whose Judgment All men should be interiourly (for faith is in the interiour) bound to follow in all their differences and Controversies; insomuch that it must be one of the highest degrees of Treason against God, not to submit his Judgment to the Judgment of him, whom God should appoint for the Judge of all Matters of faith. For if there be no such severe Obligation to submit to the Judgment of this Judge, then might every Man chuse, whether he would in his Interiour Judgment submit to this Judge or No. And so that very Absurdity and very Perdition of Souls would follow, which is in the having no Judge at all: to wit, that every Man might believe in his *Interiour Judgment* (in which onely faith consists) what should seem to him to be grounded in Scripture; And so as *the private Judgment of discretion in one Man is directly Opposite and Contrary to another Mans private Judgment of discretion*, the faith of the One would be directly contrary to the faith of the Other: And yet there is but one faith True, without which One true faith it is Impossible to please God, and consequently to be saved. How then should God have provided sufficiently for Mens Salvation, if after their most Careful reading and Conferring the Scriptures, No One Man among those Thousand Men, who even then differ in Religion, No One Man, I say, but that One Man

who

who holdeth the Truth (which is but One) should Interiourly follow that faith, without which it is Impossible to be saved? It must needs then be a most damnable Sin to commit that highest treason against Gods Judge, which is committed by not submitting our Interiour Judgment unto him; being that in this our proceeding we go Away, in which all unity in Interiour faith (which is in the first place to be regarded) is wholly Impossible to be kept.

Let us then see (as a thing which concerneth us both most needly) who is Guilty of this high Treason, I, who am a Roman Catholick, or You, who are not: for our faith being Contrary in Prime points, one of us must needs go astray from that One faith, without which it is Impossible to please God. And he of us Two who thus strayeth, therefore strayeth (and by doing so, teacheth others to stray) because he doth not submit his Judgment to the Judgment of this Judge: for if we both did this, we should joyn in all possible unity of this One, true faith. 5.

And here comes in that most Important question, Who is this Judge, to whom All are thus to submit their Judgment in all Controversies of faith? For if we can find out this Judge, we can never remain in any doubt; for without all doubt, we must stand to the Judgment of this Judge, what reasons soever our private Judgment of Discretion may suggest; or else we had as good have no Judge at all, and it is not our Own private Judgment of discretion, but the Publick Judgment of that Judge whom Christ hath appointed us, and which we are obliged to follow, as hath been shewn. 6.

All Protestants do say, that the Scripture, and onely the Scripture is left us by Christ for our Judge, to end and determine with Infallible Authority all our doubts, differences, and Controversies in Religion. And in this their Tenent they agree with all Hereticks which have risen up against the Church of Christ. We Roman Catholicks do profess, that all reverence and all Credit is 7.

due unto the Scriptures, as unto the Infallible word of God; insomuch, that we are ready to give our lives in defence of any thing which is affirmed in Scripture. I add that we and only we do truly believe the Scriptures; for he only truly believeth any thing with divine faith, who groundeth his Assent upon divine Revelation: But the Assent of Roman Catholicks only (with which they believe the Scriptures to be Gods undoubted word) is grounded on divine Revelation, manifested to them by his Church, which (as I will shew) is Infallible. The Assent, by which others believe the Scriptures to be Gods undoubted word, is not grounded on this Revelation manifested by his Church, as they all confess, neither is it grounded upon any other divine Revelation, as I will now prove. For if there be any such Revelation manifested to them, it is manifested to them in the Scriptures, as they say: But there is no such Revelation manifested to them in the Scriptures, for it is written no where in the Scriptures, that such and such books of Scripture be Canonical, and the undoubted word of God; therefore this cannot be believed for any Revelation made manifest to us in Scripture. They believe therefore this without any revelation made by God, and so their Belief is not Divine, but a humane belief, just such an one as we have, that such and such a book is *Virgil*'s, such a book is *Cicero*'s, &c. And if they tell me, that they by reading Canonical Scriptures, do see a light clearly manifesting them to be Gods word, I answer, that the sight by this light is no certain divine revelation, but a humane perswasion subject to falsity, and that far more then the light, by which whole General Councels have seen the quite Contrary, as I clearly will prove, *Numb.* 13. A second convincing Argument to prove, that onely we truely believe the Scriptures, is, that all others who understand not Hebrew and Greek in which the Scriptures were written, cannot know by any divine faith the undoubted word of God, but they all take upon trust of

Men

Men fallible the Translations, which they call Gods word, which Translations are full of many and grois corruptions, as concerning our English Bible in particular many have shewed. Now then there is not one amongst ten thousand, who perfectly understand Greek and Hebrew; Therefore all the rest have onely a humane perswasion, that their Scriptures be Gods uncorrupted word. For I am sure it is no where revealed, that these Translations be Gods uncorrupted word. The Roman Catholick hath still the Authority of a Church Infallible, to assure him which is, which is not Gods uncorrupted word. This Authority I will prove to be Divine and warranted by God. But yet we hold it Impossible, that the book of the Scripture should be the Judge appointed by Christ to end all Controversies, or that it should be that *Holy way, that shall be unto us a direct way, that fools cannot erre by it.* For we see with our eyes whole Thousands of Men very wise and Learned, whilst they follow the Scriptures with all sincerity (as they most solemnly protest from their heart) to follow a world of quite contrary ways in matter of highest Importance to Salvation, and consequently all these Multitudes of wise men, but those who go one only of these wayes, must needs go astray. Now if wise Men in so great Multitudes do so strangely stray, whilst in all sincerity (as they protest) they follow this way, how is it true, that *fools cannot erre by it?* Doth not St. *Austin*, and all the greatest Doctors that ever the Church had, profess themselves unable to understand the Scriptures, and this after many years study in them? and how then can men of such ordinary Capacities, and of so mean study and knowledg of those tongues in which the Scriptures were written, and so great variety of Opinions about the true Canon of Scriptures, and a far greater variety about the true Interpretation of so many most Important places of the true Canon of Scripture, come to know the truth, the Infallible and undoubted truth, and this so assuredly, that they

may with a safe Conscience upon their private Judgment or discretion settle their faith unmoveably in points which they know to be so mightily called into doubt by the greater Part of the world, yea that whole General Councels have unanimously defined the Contrary, and believed those places of Scripture not to say that to be so, which, for those places of Scripture, they still say and firmly believe to be so? Is not such a belief mainly to be suspected, even in the wisest and learnedst Men? And will you then say still, that this is *A direct way unto us, so that fools cannot erre by it?* The contrary will yet appear far more clearly, when you shall have pondered the ensuing reasons: yet take this for one strong reason, why the Scriptures cannot be that Judge of Controversies who is to direct us, by a *way so direct unto us, that fools cannot erre by it.*

8. The second Reason, to prove the Scriptures not to be this Judge, is this. There be many Controversies, and may be yet very many more, most nearly concerning the necessary Means to Salvation, which can never be ended, and undoubtedly decided by the Judgment and sentence of the Scriptures. I will alledge several convincing Examples. For a Controversie may be moved concerning the lawfulness of working, or not working upon *Saturdayes* and *Sundayes*. How will this Controversie be decided by the Scriptures? All the old Scriptures command strictly the not working upon *Saturdayes*, and no One single word of the New Scripture doth assure us, that this Command was ever by Lawful Authority taken away, or that there is the least unlawfulness in working upon the *Sunday*. We know indeed, that there was such a day as the Lords day, called by that name, because Saint *John* had a vision upon that day, as he had also upon many other dayes. We know St. *Paul* preached upon the first day of the week, and so he did upon many other dayes, and most upon the Saturday or Sabboth. For

*He disputed in the Synagogue every Sabboth, and he exhorted the Jews and the Greeks.* (*Act.* 18.) We know the first day of the week was at one time appointed for the gathering of Almes for poor Christians: But how doth this or any of the former Places prove the Commandement of not working on the Saturday to be taken quite away, and that undoubtedly? Or how do any of these places impose upon All Christians, a manifest and unquestionable Obligation of not working on Sundays? And yet this is All that can be said out of the Scriptures for the undoubted abolishing of a certain Commandement of God, and the undoubted bringing into the place of it a New Commandement, without perhaps the Rising onely of our Saviour on the Sunday be sufficient to prove both these things undoubtedly. Yet how can this be? For the day of his Ascension into Heaven was the final period of all he did in the world, and that day was Thursday. The Resurrection indeed might be a Ground for such a Change, but it is no where in Scripture that such a Change was made on that Ground. Yea if we stand even to the New Scriptures, our Adversaries the Jews will be too hard for us. For they will tell us, that according to our Scriptures, when our Saviour was asked (*Mat.* 19.) *What good shall I do, that I may have life Everlasting?* our Saviour said, *If thou wilt enter into life, keep the Commandements.* And when that Man replyed, to know what Commandement he did understand, he clearly told him, that he understood the Commandements of the Decalogue, *Those very Commandements which that Man knew well* enough, (as it is said clearly also in St. *Mark* 10. *Luke* 18.) You see here (will a Jew, or some new Sectary say unto us) that even in our new Law, our own Law-maker with his own mouth commandeth, as a thing necessary to enter into life Everlasting, the keeping of the Commandements of the Decalogue, which that Man did know. Therefore he in the New Law commanded that Commandement of keeping the Saturday to be ob-

observed, as well as the rest. And St. *Paul* (1 *Cor.* 7. 19.) *Circumcision is nothing, and Prepuce is nothing, but the Observation of the Commandements of God.* See here St. *Paul*, even after Circumcision was declared nothing, to declare the Commandements of God to stand in force; and yet among these Commandements, a chief one is, the keeping of the Saturday, or seventh day, on which God rested: which reason also holdeth still, for still it is true, that God rested on the seventh Day, and *he blessed the seventh Day, and sanctified it*, for the foresaid Reason. How came this Sanctification and Blessing to be lost, the reason of it being still as good as ever? And why then (will this Jew or Sectarist say) should we prefer the keeping of any other day before this, which hath so good a Reason, that you cannot give a better, at least undoubtedly better, and which hath so manifest Authority of the Old and of the New Scriptures, even Three of the four Evangelists, and also in St. *Paul*; whereas for the taking away of this Commandement, or for the not working on the Sunday, there is not one single Place in all the Bible, much lesse such a place as manifestly convinceth? This Argument is unanswerable to those who make the Scriptures the sole Judge of Controversies.

9. Again, these Jews and new Sectaries will presse us, that our own Scriptures (which we hold onely to be our Judge in all Controversies) do cleerly tell us, that even in the New Law it is said (*Act.* 15.) *It hath seemed good to the holy Ghost and us* (Apostles of the New Law) *to lay no further burthen upon you, then these necessary things, that you abstaine from the things immolated to Idols, and blood, and that which is strangled.* See here, among Necessary things, one is, to abstain from blood (which Christians do not, nor think not to be done; for they freely eat black Puddings) and also to abstain from things strangled, as when we strangle Chickens and eat them freely. If you tell me, that Scripture onely is Iudge of Con-

Controversies, I will tell you that by the Iudgement of this Iudge (following no other as infallible) woe be to the Opinion of all Catholiques and Protestants, who hold it lawful to work upon Saturdayes, unlawful on Sundayes; lawful to eat Blood and Strangled things, unlawful to abstain from them, as still forbidden: woe I say to our Opinion, for it not onely will not be judged as undoubtedly true by Scripture, but also it will, and that undoubtedly, be judged false by the Places now cited. I pray tell me here, how Men of mean capacity, yea how Men of the greatest capacity in the World, shall be able to finde by the judgement of Scripture onely, what is Infallibly to be believed in these points, in which so many hundred Thousands of Jewes damnably differ from us.

Did not all this Kingdome of *England* grounded upon Scriptures, clear enough (as they said) both hold and swear, that they held the King, the Head of the Church? can any point in the Church be of higher concernment to the Church, then to know for certain their own Head? And yet this point is now no longer ascertained us by the Infallible judgement of Scripture. 10.

For another example, what Controversie can more import, then to be undoubtedly, and by Infallible Authority secured, which books of Scripture be Canonical, and the certain Word of God, and which be not? You say there is no Infallibility of any verity to be had but by the Scripture. But I say, that in all the Scripture no Infallibility can be had concerning the Canon of the Scripture: wherefore either we cannot know this most important point of all points infallibly, or else we must acknowledge the Church to be Infallible: for the Scripture in this point is wholly silent. We dispute and differ highly about the books of *Maccabees*, whether they be the certain Word of God or no. I pray tell me, how shall this grand Controversie be decided, and decided Infallibly by the judgement of Scripture? *Luther* denyeth the *Apocalypse* to be true 11.

true Scripture: we all in *England* ſtand out againſt him. I pray tell me what Scripture we have againſt him that is Infallible, without begging the queſtion which is called into Controverſie.

12. We all believe the Goſpel of St. *Matthew*, not onely to be the true Goſpel of Chriſt and his Word, but alſo to be the Goſpel of St. *Matthew*, as alſo the Goſpel of St. *Mark* to be written by St. *Mark*. If any Man ſhould deny this, what place of Scripture could we cite againſt him? or what Infallible ground have we of this our belief? The *Marcioniſts*, the *Cerdoniſts*, the *Manicheans* do abſolutely deny St. *Matthews* Goſpel to be Gods Word. This Controverſie, you ſay, and all other Controverſies of Faith, is to be ended by the Scripture: I ask what place of Scripture will end this Controverſie, and all other Controverſies about all other books of Scripture, which have almoſt all been denyed to be Gods Word, by ſome Hereticks or other. And as for St. *Matthew*, you muſt know that all Ancient Writers, no one excepted, do ſay, that he did write in Hebrew; and yet neither his Hebrew Goſpel, nor any one certain Copy of it is extant in the World. Tell me then, upon what undoubted Ground you beleeve any thing that is in St. *Matthews* Goſpel onely. The Greek Tranſlation which we have, was made by God knows whom: for we know not. He might be a faithful, or unfaithful Tranſlator, he might uſe a falſe uncorrect Copy, he might miſtake in many places by Ignorance, in many by Negligence or Malice. Upon what Infallible ground ſhall a converted *Manichean* (as St. *Auſtin* for example) believe this Greek Goſpel which we have? By what Scripture will you preſſe him to it? yea, upon what Scripture do you your ſelves beleeve this Goſpel (this Greek Tranſlation of S. *Matthew*?) If you tell me Saint *Matthew* did write in Greek, I muſt tell you, that all Antiquity (no one antient Author excepted) ſay the contrary. How will you then ground Infallible belief, upon your ſo

new

new and so uncertain Opinions. When this question was moved, whether any Book was to be received as the Infallible Word of God or no? The Holy Fathers could never finde any more undoubted ground, then that the Church did allow of or not allow of such Books to be held for Gods undoubted Word. Upon this ground St. *Athanasius* (*in fine Synopsis*) receiveth the Gospel of St. *Matthew*, and the other Three Gospels, and rejected the Gospel of St. *Thomas*. Upon this Ground *Tertullian*, St. *Hierome*, St. *Austin*, and St. *Leo*, professe themselves to admit such, and to deny other Books to be Canonical. Upon this ground it is, that *Eusebius* (*Hist. Eccles. l.* 3. 19.) saith, such Scriptures are held for true, genuine, and manifestly allowed by the opinion of all, because they are so *According to the Tradition of the Church, and that by this Evident Note or Mark, they are distinguished from others.* Behold the most perspicuous mark, by which Scriptures could be Infallibly known to be, or not be Gods undoubted Word, is the Tradition of the Church. Whence St. *Austin*, giving a reason to the *Manichaans* (who believed some part of the Gospel) why he cited the *Acts* of the Apostles (which they believed not) saith thus, *Which Book* (of the *Acts*) *it is necessary for me to believe, if I believe the Gospel, being the Catholick Authority in like manner commendeth both these Scriptures to me.* So he, *contra Ep. Fund. c.* 4.

By this the Author of the Reply may see how Insufficient his Answer (*pag.* 25.) is, when he saith, *Indeed we take the Canonical Books by Tradition from the Church, but we do not take them to be Canonical upon her Tradition; but assent is setled in them as Canonical, in the way of Faith, because they are such: In thy light we shall see light; so by Scripture we shall see Scripture.* So he, but not so any one of the Fathers, who were most often pressed to give a reason why they believed such Books to be Canonical, why not. None of these professed themselves to be so sharp sighted, that by seeing onely Canonical Scriptures, they could see them 13.

to be Canonical Scriptures, and that so manifestly, as to ground their Faith upon it. You by the *Apocalyps* see it to be Canonical; your most illuminated *Luther* could not see it to be so by that light. By all the light he had, he Judged St. *James* his Epistle to be made of Straw, yet you see in it a light, shewing undoubtedly it to be Gods Word. You cannot see the two first Books of *Maccabees* to be Canonical, yet St. *Austin* believed them to be so, for that the Councel of *Carthage* (*Can.* 47.) received them for such; as also the books of *Wisdome*, of which St. *Austin* saith, *That it was received of all Christian Bishops, and others, even to the last of the Laity, with veneration of Divine Authority* (*l. de Prædest. Sanct. Sanctorum* 14.) What more cleer? And yet you see, that all you of the Church of *England*, *deny all veneration of Divine Authority to that Book*. By what Scripture shall we end this and the like Controversies of other Books, for which we have as strong proofs as these now cited; and you have onely so weak a proof, as is a light so peculiar to your selves. And upon the certainty given you, onely by this light, you firmely believe all the Scripture that you believe, that is, all the Faith you have, all the Beliefe you have depends upon this; *That you can see so evidently such and such a Book to be Canonical, that this your Sight, by light received from those Book, showing them to be assuredly Canonical, is the onely Infallible Assurance you have, that such and such Books are Canonical*; and consequently, this your peculiar sight is the onely Infallible Ground you have to rely upon these books, as upon the undoubted Word of God. This is your Doctrine, this is your *Holy Way, a way so direct, that fools cannot erre by it*, though you professe so many wise Men in this point have erred, even whole General Councels, as also so many great Doctors, before whose eyes this same light stood as clear as before yours: for they Judged very many to be Canonical Scriptures which you deny; so weak a ground are you all forced to rely upon, even in the

the main Point of Eternal Salvation, whilest you refuse to rely on the Infallible Authority of Christs Church. Neither doth this our relying on the Churches Authority derogate to the Scriptures: for we do not say, that the Church maketh them true Scriptures, but it maketh us to have an Infallible Ground to hold them for true Scriptures as they are in themselves, and that not because the Church maketh them held to be so, but because they are true in themselves, as being the Word of God; yet not known by themselves to be so by any Infallible knowledge, without this the testimony of the Church; as Christ was the Lamb of God who taketh away the sins of the World, but the Infallible testimony of St. *John Baptist*, made many know, that he was so. And thus Christ was made known to the world by the Infallible testimony of his Apostles; upon whose testimony many Thousands believed before the Scriptures were written. Therefore for the Scriptures to be believed what they are of themselves, for the Infallible Testimony of the Church, doth no more derogate to their honour, or make the Church Superiour to them, then it derogateth to the honour of the Son of God to be believed to be what he is, upon the Infallible testimony of his Apostles; which testimony had it not been Infallible, those who grounded their Faith upon it had had no Infallible ground to believe our Saviour to be him, who he is. In like manner, if the Authority of the Church, testifying such and such books to be Gods Word, were not Infallible, we should have no Infallible ground to know them to be such, though they truly be such of themselves: but of this Infallibility I will say no more.

Now I will go on, and shew yet further, that the Scriptures cannot be the Judges of all Controversies: for many things are set down in Scripture in such manner, that almost all the Controversies which are in the Church, do arise about the true Interpretation of the Scripture. And 14.

God did well know that this would happen, and therefore he must needs know that he should give the world a very unprofitable Judge, in order to the keeping of Unity, and deciding of Controversies, if he should onely leave them a Book, about the true meaning of which Book he well knew more Controversies and Disunions in Religion would arise, then about any other matter; so that the greatest Wits here being at greatest dissention, this cannot be *The holy way, a way so direct to us, that fools cannot erre by it.* No Law-maker of any Common-wealth did ever provide so simply for the Unity of it, as to leave them onely a Book of Lawes to be the sole Judge of all their Controversies, as I shewed before. And surely if Christ had intended to leave us a Book to be our sole Judge in all Controversies, then undoubtedly he would in some part of this Book have clearly told us so, this importing so exceedingly as it doth, and yet he hath not done so. Secondly, if he would have given us a Book for Judge he would never have given us for our Judge, such a Book as the Scripture is, which very often speaketh, sometimes so Prophetically, that most would think it spoke of the present time, when it speaketh of the time to come; that it spoke of one person, for example, of *David*, when it speaketh of Christ; sometime it speaketh by a Figure, by a Metaphor, by a Parable, it hath Tropological, Allegorical, Anagogical, and Mystical senses. It useth the Imperative Mood, as well for Councels as Commands. In no place it so much goeth about to set down a Catalogue of any particular points necessary, and onely necessary to be believed, which any wise Law-maker would do, if he intended by his writings to end all Controversies in Faith: yea, the Scripture seemeth often to say evidently that, which according to your Doctrine is false. You hold for Superstitious, the Annoynting of sick Persons, with certain Prayers, and yet Saint *James* saith (cap. 5. ver. 14.) *Is any sick among you? let him call for the Priests of the Church, and let them pray over him,*

*him, annointing him with Oyl, and if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him.* Is not this Controversie clearly by this place of Scripture decided against you? or, have you any one place half so clear to the contrary? Again, about those other most clear words spoken in the Institution of another great Sacrament, in which any wise Man would speak clearly, *This is my Body*, the late Adversaries of the Roman Church have found out above two hundred several Interpretations. They will needs have the sense to be figurative, although never any Man in any figurative speech was heard to speak thus: For example, to take a Vine, a Lamb, a Door in his hand, and say, this Vine, this Lamb, this Door is Christ; This is no kinde of figurative speech, though it be a clear figure to say, *Christ is a Vine, a Lamb, a Door*, yea he is Bread: But to take Bread into a Mans hand, as Christ did, and then say, *This Bread is my Body*; to take a Cup of Wine into his hand, and to say, *This is the Cup of my Blood, which shall be shed for you*, doth not so much as sound like a figurative speech; and yet our Adversaries think it so certainly to be so, that they venture their Souls upon that their conceived certainty. Thus you see, when the Scripture in four several places delivereth these four words, *This is my Body*; Men will hold it to be clear, that so clear words be not clear, and will venture their Salvation upon this their Imagination. In this and many other points, we say, the Scripture is clear for us: The *Lutherans* say, it is clear for them: The *Calvinists* say, it is clear for them. We have conferred Place with Place, we have looked in the Originals; and after all this, the Scripture doth not decide this Controversie; but when all is done, we are as far from Agreeing, and being brought to the undoubted knowledge of the most important truth, as we were at the beginning.

15. Another very strong Argument, to declare that the Scripture cannot be the Judge of all Controversies in

points of Faith necessary to Salvation, is this; That there be many points, the believing of which is necessary to Salvation, which points are no where set down clearly in Scripture. For first, you make it the chief point of all points, to believe the Scripture to be the Judge of all Controversies, and by it self sufficient to end them all. I ask, where is this point of points which you make the ground of your belief? where is it, I say, set down in Scriptures, and that so clearly, that no prudent doubt can be made, but that such words clearly say what you say? Doth not Saint *Athanasius* in his Creed put down as an undoubted Article of Catholick Faith, (*which Faith* (as he saith) *without a Man hold it entirely and inviolably, without all doubt he shall perish eternally*) doth he not put down there, that we must believe, That God the Father is not begotten, that God the Son is not made, but begotten by his Father only; that the holy Ghost is neither made, nor begotten, but doth proceed, and that both from the Father and the Son; *And that he, who will be saved, must believe thus?* And yet how far are these most hard points from being clearly deliver'd in the Scripture. So also, that God the Son is Consubstantial to his Father, and of the same Substance, is a certain Article of Faith, and yet no where clearly delivered in Scripture, but was believed by All upon the sole Authority of the Church, which consequently was believed Infallible.

16. I have already shewed, that the necessary Comandment of keeping the Sunday in place of the Saturday is no where in Scripture, but rather the contrary. How then can I believe this for the Scripture, or for any clear place of it, there being no such place to be found? I have also shewed, that it is no where in Scripture set down at all (much lesse set down clearly and manifestly) which Books of Scripture be Canonical, which not. How then by the Testimony of Scripture which giveth no Testimony at all of this point, can I believe such books undoubtedly to be, such not to be Canonical? Baptisme of Children to be Necessary to

their

their salvation is a prime point of Belief, and yet you cannot believe this prime point upon any clear place of Scripture (for there is no such place) but you must all say with the great Saint *Austin*, *That though nothing for certain can be alledged out of Canonical Scriptures in this point, yet in this point, the truth of Scriptures,* (and consequently a sufficient ground for Faith) *is kept by us, when we do that which seemed good to the Catholick Church, which Church the Authority of the same Scriptures doth commend.* (*Contra Crescon.* l. 1. 33.) And this following the Tradition of the Church, he calleth *The most true and inviolable Rule of Truth.* He holdeth therefore Tradition of the Church so Infallible, that it may be a ground for Faith. He was taught so by Saint *Paul*, (2 Thes. 2.) *Hold the Traditions which you have received either by word of Mouth, or by Epistle.* Upon which place, Saint *Chrysostome* having taught that the Apostles delivered many things by word of Mouth, not set down anywhere in writing; he saith, *that these* (unwritten Traditions) *are worthy of the same belief which those deserve which are written: It is a Tradition* (of the Catholick Church) *Seek no further.* So he. But you say, I must seek further to find this in Scripture, yet Saint *Chrysostome* tells me, that being a Tradition of the Church, it is Gods Word, and upon this account as worthy to be believed as if it were his written Word: for it is the being his Word, and not the being of his written Word, which maketh it Infallibly true.

Well then, It having been made clear by all these reasons and authorities, that the Scriptures cannot be intended by Christ for the Judge of all our Controversies in Faith, and that their reading cannot be that *Holy way, a way so direct unto us, that fools cannot erre by it*; Let us see where this way is to be found, and who is to be judge to define all Controversies with Infallible authority, so that all are bound to submit their Interiour judgement (in which all faith consists) to this Authority, it being high Treason a- 17.

gainst

gainſt Chriſt, not to ſubmit to an Authority inſtituted by him purpoſely to oblige all to this ſubmiſſion. I ſay this Judge is the Catholique Church. This I will prove firſt, and this being proved, I will ſhew briefly that no Church but the *Roman* can prudently be held to be this Catholique Church. In proof of the Catholique Church her being Judge of all Controverſies, I alledge firſt thoſe words, (*Matth. 16. v. 18. I ſay unto thee,* (that is to St. *Peter* by name) *Thou art* Peter, (that is, Thou art a Rock;) *and upon this Rock I will build my Church, and the Gates of Hell ſhall not prevail againſt it*; that is, thoſe Gates of Hell out of which ſo many damnable Errours ſhall iſſue, ſhall never prevail by inducing any damnable Error into that Church, which I will build upon thee, O *Peter*, and thy Succeſſours; which I add, becauſe this Church was not to be built upon the Perſon of St. *Peter* onely; for then this fair building had fallen to the ground when St. *Peter* had died. They who do ſay, that the Church may fall into damnable Errors, do ſay, that the Church may fall to the ground, and that the Gates of Hell may prevail againſt it: for what greater fall can it have, then by damnable Errors to make its Members all fall into Hell? and in what manner can the Gates of Hell more prevail againſt it? And yet we are ſure by Gods Word, that ſhall never happen. Wherefore in this Church we imbrace moſt groundedly all things propoſed by it to be believed. Here you ſee our Judge, Chriſts Church, hath Gods warrant to warrant Her from bringing in any damnable Error by her Judgement: All may therefore ſecurely obey. But that none can ſecurely diſobey her Judgement, Chriſt alſo doth warrant us, in the next Chapter but one: (for *Matth.* 18. *v.* 17.) he ſaith, *Tell the Church, and if he will not hear the Church, Let him be unto thee as a Heathen and Publican.* Here you ſee all Cauſes of greater Importance are to be brought to this Judge: for if even private complaints are to be brought into her Tribunal, and if for diſobedience after her Judge-

ment

ment given of them, a man be to be held for a Publican or Heathen, much more are enormiously hurtful crimes, such as are the crimes of Hereſie, to be carried to her Tribunal, and thoſe, who in ſo much more Importing matters diſobey, are alſo much more to be held for Publicans and Heathens. And that no man may think, that after this his condemnation he may ſtand well in his *Interiour*, perſiſting ſtill in the ſame judgement, and doing ſo, ſtand right in the ſight of God, it followeth, *Amen I ſay unto you* (Prelates of my Church) *Whatſoever ye ſhall bind upon Earth, ſhall alſo be bound in Heaven.* You ſee I have found a Judge ſo ſecurely to be followed in his Judgement, and ſo unſafely to be diſobeyed, that his Sentence given upon Earth, is ſure to be ratified in Heaven. This alſo could not be true, if this Judge were fallible in ſuch prime cauſes, as moſt concern the Church, and all ſuch cauſes are thoſe which may bring in damnable Errors.

Conformably to this doctrine of the Church, her being our Judge, Saint *Auſtin* (*de Civit. l.* 20. 9.) expounds to our purpoſe thoſe words of the *Apocalypſe* or *Revelation*, (cap. 20. ver. 4.) *I ſaw Seats, and they ſate upon them, and Judgement was given them. It is not to be expounded of the laſt Judgement, but of the Seats of Prelates, and the Prelates themſelves, by which the Church is now governed, are to be underſtood.* 18.

All this which I have ſaid out of the New Teſtament, you will the leſſe wonder at, if you Note, that even in the Old Law it is ſaid, *The lips of the Prieſt ſhall keep knowledge, and they ſhall require the Law from his Mouth, becauſe he is the Angel of the Lord God of Hoſts,* (*Mal* 2.) Note here a groſſe corruption of the Engliſh Bible, which readeth theſe words, *The Prieſts lips ſhould keep knowledge, and they ſhould ſeek the Law at his mouth*, whereas the Originals ſpeak clearly in the future Tenſe. Here by the way, I muſt tell you, that, though the Scripture were to be Judge, yet your moſt corrupted *Engliſh* Scriptures cannot be allowed for Judge. Whence it followeth, that thoſe who

do understand onely *English*, can judge of nothing by their Scripture: And so they must trust their Ministers to the full as much, even in this highest point, as we do our Priests in any point.

19. But let us proceed; You see first, that I have found a *way so direct, that fools cannot erre by it*: for any man may ask the Priests of the Church, what is the known Doctrine of the Church, and then let him rest securely, when he knoweth that. Secondly, you see I have found such a Judge, as all true believers had for all their Controversies for more then two thousand years together, before *Moses* did write the first Books of Scripture; all which time you must needs make the Tradition of the Church the infallible Rule of Faith: for here was no written Word of God, upon which their Faith could be built, and yet Saint *Paul*, (2 *Cor.* 4.) speaking of those who lived in those Ages before all Scripture, saith, *They had the same Spirit of Faith.* And the reason is clear: for the Word of God is the same, whether it be revealed by the Pen, or by the Tongue, written or not written. *And what* (saith St. *Irenæus*, *l.* 3. *c.* 4.) *if the Apostles had not left us the Scriptures? Must we not have followed that order of Tradition, which they delivered to those, to whose Charges they left the Churches to be governed? To this order* (of Tradition by the unwritten word) *many of those barbarous Nations do assent, who have believed in Christ, without any writing or Inke, having Salvation written in their hearts by the Holy Ghost, and keeping diligently the ancient Traditions.* So St. *Irenæus*, who you see holdeth manifestly unwritten Traditions of the Church to be a sufficient Ground of Faith. It is most manifestly true, which he saith, that upon this ground the Faith of whole Nations have relyed. This ground therefore is infallible, all Nations Faith relying on this, even two Thousand years and more before the first Scriptures were written, and the Faith of many other Nations, who since their writing have believed, and do believe the true Faith. For how many

of

of them never did see the Scriptures at all, or never did see them in a Language, which they could understand? Neither did the Apostles, or their Successors take any care to have the Scripture communicated to all Nations in such languages, as they could all, or the greater part understand. They thought the Tradition of the Church a sufficient Rule of Faith for all, which they could not do, if this Rule were fallible: We must therefore confesse it to be Infallible.

Thirdly, I have not onely found a Judge, so clearly 20.
poinring out the way, that fools cannot erre by it, but such a Judge as no exception can be taken against his sufficiency: for no other Judge was in the Church for some Thousands of years amongst the most true Beleevers, and afterwards amongst whole Nations. Fourthly, I have found a Judge, to whom Christ hath given a certain Promise, to teach no damnable error, by which Doctrine the Gates of Hell should prevail against her. Fifthly, I have found a Judge, whom All men are obliged (I say obliged by Interiour Assent in point of Faith) to obey, under pain of being held here for Heathens or Publicans, and looked upon as such by the Judgement of Heaven, binding what the Church bindeth. Sixtly, I have found a living Judge, who can be informed of all Controversies arising from time to time, and who can hear Me and You, and be heard by Me and You: that neither I nor You can doubt of the true meaning of this Church, or if we doubt, we can propose our doubt, and she will tell us clearly her meaning; whereas the Bible can neither hear a Thousand new Controversies which arise daily, nor be heard clearly to give any certain Sentence in them, but onely say the same still which she said even before the Controversies began, and about which Sentence of hers, all the Controversie did arise; neither doth the Bible give any such Judgement, as will suffice to hold these and these men, who teach these and these errors, for Heathens and Publicans, which the

Church doth so clearly and so manifestly, that they themselves cannot deny themselves to be condemned by the Church, together with their Doctrine; but all they can do, is, to raile against their Judge, which the damned shall do against Christ their Judge.

21. I see no exception there can be made against this Judge: Onely you will tell me, that Infallibility is wholly necessary for the Judge of Faith, which I also confesse; yet I also say, that this Church of Christ, must be confessed to be Infallible. But withall, I would have every one know, that the Roman Church doth oblige to no more, then to believe that the Pope defining with a lawful General Councel, cannot erre; for it is no necessary Article of Faith, to believe that the Pope or head of the Church cannot erre, when he defineth without a General Councel. Now that this definition of a whole General Councel is Infallible, ought not to seem strange to any Christian: for who can think it strange, that Christ, for the secure direction of the first Christians whom the Apostles converted, should give this Infallibility to all and every one of the Apostles, and that he should regard so little the secure direction of all other Christians, who were to be from the Apostles time, to the end of the world, that for their sakes, & for the secure direction of their Souls, he would not give this Infallibility so much as to one Man, no not to all the Prelats of Christianity assembled together with their head, to define matters most necessary, and in which all error would be most pernicious; who I say, could think this strange: especially, being this gift of Infallibility is given, not for their private sakes to whom it is given, but for the universal good, and necessary direction, concord, and perpetual unity of the whole Church? You must acknowledge that he gave Infallibility of Doctrine to all those, who did write any small part of the Old or New Scripture. He gave it to *David*, though he was an Adulterer: he gave it to *Solomon*, who proved not only a most vicious Man in Life, but who for his own person in point of Faith, came to fall into Worship-

shipping of Idols. This you will not have thought strange, but you will hold it incredible, that he should give this Infallibility, not to one Man, but the whole Church, represented in a General Councel.

Let us passe on further yet, and see how firmly this Infallibility is grounded. I have above shewed how strongly it is grounded on those words of God, promising a *Holy way, a way so direct unto us, that fools cannot erre by it.* See here the third Number. In the eight Number I have shewed, that we cannot ground that Faith, by which we believe the Sabbath to be changed to the Sunday, upon Scripture; but we must ground it upon the Tradition of the Church, which if it be not Infallible, we have no Infallible Ground at all for this point. And in the ninth Number, I have shewed the self-same to be about eating Blood, or Chickens, or any thing that is strangled. In the 11, 12, and 13. Number, I have demonstrated, that by the Scripture we cannot know which is true Scripture, which is false; which Books be Infallibly the Word of God, which not; for the Scripture hath not one Text in which it telleth us this: and therefore for this Important point of Faith, we can finde no other sure Ground, then the Tradition of an Infallible Church: for a fallible Tradition may deceive us. In the 14. Number I have shewed, that when Controversies arise (as most, and most Important Controversies do arise) about the true meaning of the Scripture, even after we have conferred all places together, and looked upon the Original Languages, the the Controversies still remain undecided, and no Infallible way can be found to decide them by Scripture. There is therefore no Infallible way to decide them, if the decision and definition of the whole Church in a General Councel be not Infallible. This is so clear, that (to the wonder of the world) *Luther* himself, in his Book of the Power of the Pope, writeth thus. *We are not certain, of any private Man, that he hath the Revelation of the Father. The Church alone it is, of which it is not lawful to doubt.* So he. In the 22.

15. Number I have shewed, that there be many points necessarily to be believed under pain of damnation, which points are not at all set down in any clear Scripture. For these points it is manifest, that we can have no other ground then the Authority of the Church. If this be not Infallible, then we have onely fallible ground, which cannot be a ground of Faith. In the 16. Number I have confirmed the same Doctrine by the Authority of Saint *Austin* and Saint *Chrysostome*. In the 17. Number I have proved this Doctrine clearly out of Gods Promise, that *he would build this his Church upon a Rock, and that the Gates of Hell should not prevail against it*, which the Gates of Hell might easily do, if the Church could come to teach damnable errors, carrying her and her Children into the Gates of Hell it self. The same in the same place I have proved by Gods commanding us to *Tell the Church*, and commanding us to hold all those who will not hear the Church, as Publicans and Heathens; and by making good in Heaven the Sentence of the Church given upon Earth, which he would not do, if the Church should have at any time failed in her definition, and that in points damnably erroneous. In the 18. Number I have alledged other Texts, still proving the same. In the 19. Number I have shewed, that for two Thousand years together, before the Scriptures were written, the true believers had no other sure ground of their Faith, but the Authority of the Church, which if it had been fallible, the very ground of their Faith had been groundlesse, and none at all. The first Believers also, and many whole Nations, had no other ground, then the said Authority of the Church, as there I have shewed out of Saint *Irenæus*, and it is clear of it self; for they did not build their Faith on any Scriptures. Thus far I have gone already in the proof of the Infallibility of the Church. Now I go on with those words of Saint *Paul* (1 Tim. 3. v. 15.) where the Church of the living God, is called, *The Pillar and Ground of Truth*. May not Men rely

ſecurely upon the Pillar of Truth? May they not ground themſelves aſſuredly on the ground of Truth? No ground being ſurer ground, and more infallible then the ground of Truth it ſelf. Yea, my Adverſary having found a place in St. *Irenæus*, calling *the Scripture the Foundation and Pillar of Faith*, doth infer that if it be ſo, *then it is the ground and cauſe of our faith*. If this conſequence be ſtrong (which I deny not) then is it yet a ſtronger, that the Truth is no where ſurer grounded, then upon *the Pillar and Foundation of Truth*. But my Adverſary would take this place of St. *Paul* from me, becauſe he ſaith, *This expreſſion may very reaſonably be referred (not to the Church, but to the myſtery of Godlyneſs) and ſo be an Hebrew form*, &c. Surely he forgot that this Epiſtle was not written in *Hebrew*, but in *Greek*; and then again, No *Hebrew* form in the world can make the ſenſe he intends. What can be clearer then this, if I ſay, *ſuch a thing was done by* Cicero *the Father of his Country, and* Cæſar *did ſuch another thing?* What I ſay more clear, then that in this ſpeech I call *Cicero The Father of his Country* and not *Cæſar*, of whom as yet I had not ſo much as ſpoken? So the Apoſtle had not ſo much as ſpoken of any Myſtery, when he ſpoke theſe words, which lie thus in your own Bible, *That thou maiſt know how to behave thy ſelf in the Houſe of God, which is the Church of the Living God, the Pillar and Ground of the Truth; and without Controverſie great is the Myſtery of Godlyneſſe*, &c. Do you not ſee, that he had not ſo much as ſpoken *of this Myſtery*, when he ſaid the former words, which in all kind of Conſtruction *per Appoſitionem*, clearly relate to the Church. O, but my Adverſary tells me, that this title of being *The Pillar and Foundation of Truth* agreeth in the firſt place to the Scripture. I anſwer, it agreeth equally to any thing, that is the *True Word of God*, and therefore it agreeth to the Scripture, becauſe God ſpeaketh by it & in it; but God alſo ſpeaketh by his Church, and in his Church, giving as much infallible aſſiſtance to the Church in a Councel, as he gave to him who

did

did deliver his Word in Scripture; for example, as he gave to *Solomon*, who in his own person came to play the Idolater. It is objected also, *that in these words rather the Office of the Church is set forth, then her Authority.* To which my Answer is clear, that her Authority cannot possibly in short words be more set out, then by saying, that she is *The Pillar and ground of Truth*: for what Authority can rely more safely, then that which relyeth *on the Pillar of Truth?* What Authority can be better founded and grounded, then that which is founded and grounded upon the *Ground and Foundation of Truth?* So that nothing can be more clear against Scripture, then to say, it doth not set out the Authority of the Church in this place, No Text being clearer for any thing. Hence when the Church had defined, that God *the Son was Consubstantial to his Father*, (that is, of one and the same substance) which is no where clearly said in Scripture, St. *Athanasius* calleth this Definition of the Church *the Word of God*, saying, that ever hereafter this Definition of the *Nicen* Councel, *That Word of God by the* Nicen *Councel doth remain for ever and ever* (Ep. ad African. Episc.) Behold here the Definition of the Councel, called *The Word of God remaining for ever and ever.* Is not this to acknowledge the Church Infallible in her Definition?

23. That place also out of St. *Matthew* proveth strongly the Churches infallibility. Christ there bids his Apostles to teach and Baptize all Nations, adding, *And behold, I am with you all dayes, even to the consummation of the world.* My Adversary saith, It is not necessary to extend this Promise to Christ his being with the Church to the end of the world; which is all one, as to say, It is not necessary that Christ his Promise should be true. For surely he cannot promise more clearly to be with his Church to the end of the world. If he should say, I will be with you for a Thousand years,

years, he should not perform his promise unlesse he were with it a thousand years: wherefore promising to be with it *even to the consummation of the world*, to make his promise true he must be with them so long. Now the Apostles were not so long as the end of the world baptizing and preaching, but their successors are with them, therefore Christ must be to the consummation of the world. And though these successors of the Apostles be not so worthy of Infallible Assistance as the Apostles were, yet Christ giving the gift of infallible assistance, not for the worth of the person to whom it is given, but for the secure direction of so many millions as were to be of the Church after Christ his time, there is as much, yea far more reason why he should leave the like secure direction for them; because the further we go from Christs time, the more we are subject to uncertainties about his Doctrine. See *Numb.* 21. It being then proved, that Christ will be with his Church untill the consummation of the world, and it being manifest that he is not with those, who live in damnable Errors, we must of necessity say that Christs Church in all ages lived secured from damnable Errors, or else there was some Age in which he was not with it, and in which he performed not his promise. And the same is to be said of that place of St. *John* (14.) *And I will aske the Father, and he will give you another Paraclete that may abide with you for ever, the Spirit of Truth.* This abiding of the spirit of Truth for ever, secures us for ever from all damnable Errors. Admirably St. *Austin.* (l de utilit. cred. c. 6.) *If the Providence of God doth not preside in humane affairs, in vain would sollicitude be about Religion; but if God be thus present with us, truely we are not to despair that there is some Authority appointed by the same God, on which Authority we relying, as on an assured step may be lifted up to God.* So he. But if this step be fallible, It is no assured step: Gods providence therefore hath left an Infallible Authority in his Church, such an Authority as the first Church had for 2000. years before any Scripture was written.

24. And do not tell me that all this is then only true, if the Church judgeth conformably to Scripture: for even in that ſenſe, the Devil himſelf, the Father of Lyes, is Infallible, as long as he teacheth conformably to Scriptures, and the Gates of Hell cannot by any error prevail againſt the Devil of Hell: yea, as long as he teacheth conformably to Scripture, he is *The Pillar and Ground of Truth.* Hath God in the Texts alledged given no more to the Church, then to the Devils? And how is this anſwer to the purpoſe, ſeeing that for two Thouſand years before Scripture, no man could know what was conformable to Scripture; yea, nothing was then conformable to any Scripture, there being no Scripture at all? And the Church then had not Gods Promiſe, which in all the Texts, Authorities and Reaſons above alledged, is, that the Church ſhall at no time teach any thing that in any damnable matter ſhall be againſt Scripture; ſo that when we know this is her Doctrine, we are ſure that this is conformable to the Scriptures rightly underſtood. And thus clearly is fulfilled thoſe notable words in the Prophet *Daniel*, (cap. 2. v. 44.) *In the dayes of thoſe Kingdomes, the God of Heaven will raiſe up a Kingdome which ſhall not be diſſipated, and his Kingdome ſhall not be delivered to another people, and it ſhall break in pieces, and conſume all theſe* (Idolatrous) *Kingdomes, and it ſhall ſtand for ever.* Now, of no Kingdome in the world, but of the Kingdome of Chriſts Church, this can be underſtood. This Church therefore *ſhall ſtand for ever.* And conſequently at no time it ſhall fall into damnable errors: for then it is true, to ſay, *It doth not ſtand, but is faln moſt damnably.* Again, in *Iſaiah* 29. God doth clearly declare his Covenant with his Church, according to the Interpretation of Saint *Paul* himſelf, (Rom. 11. 26.) *This is my Covenant with them, ſaith the Lord, my Spirit which is upon thee, and the words which I have put in thy mouth, ſhall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy ſeed, nor out of the mouth of thy ſeeds ſeed, ſaith the Lord, from henceforth*

*forth and for ever.* But how could the Word of the Lord more depart from the Mouth of the Church, then if she should with her mouth teach damnable errors? From this therefore he secureth his Church for ever and ever. Hence Saint *Austin* saith, (*l. de Unitat. Eccl. cap.* 6, 7, 12, & 13.) (See him also, *l.* 20. *de Civit. cap.* 8. *in Psalm.* 85. *& de Utilit. Credendi, c.* 8.) *Whosoever affirmeth the Church to have been overthrown* (as it were, if at any time it should teach any damnable error) *doth rob Christ of his glory and Inheritance, bought with his precious Blood*; yea, Saint *Hierom* (*cont. Lucifer. c.* 6.) goeth farther, and averreth, that *He that so saith, doth make God subject to the Devil, and a poor miserable Christ.* The reason is, because this Assertion doth (after a sort) bereave the whole Incarnation, Life and Passion of our Saviour, of their Effect and End, which was principally to found a Church and Kingdome in this world, which should endure to the day of Judgement, and direct Men in all Truth to Salvation. Wherefore, whosoever affirmeth the Church to have perished, taketh away this effect and Prerogative from his Incarnation, Life, and Passion; and avoucheth, that at some times Man had no means left to attain to everlasting blisse; which is also repugnant to the Mercy and goodnesse of God. He also maketh God subject to the Devil, in making the Devil stronger then Christ, and affirming him to have overthrown Christs Church and Kingdome, which our Lord promised should never be conquered.

That the Holy Fathers did believe the Church of Christ to be Infallible, and of an Authority sufficient to ground Faith upon, appeareth by their relying onely upon her Authority in the chiefest Articles of Faith, which is, to believe such and such Books are the true Word of God; and upon this onely ground, they ground this their Faith, as in the 12. Number I have shewed Saint *Athanasius*, Saint *Hierome*, Saint *Austin*, *Tertullian*, and *Eusebius*, to have received such Books for Gods Word, and to have not re- 25.

ceived others, and to have received such *with veneration of Divine Authority*, as St. *Austin* spoke; And upon this infallible Authority they all believed God the Father not to be begotten, God the Sonne to be begotten by his Father onely, and to be *Consubstantiall* to him; and God the Holy Ghost not to be begotten, but to proceed from both Father and Son. Upon this infallible Authority they all held children to be baptized, *though nothing for certain could be alledged out of the Canonical Scriptures in this point*, but onely the Catholique Church taught this to be done, as in the 16th. Numb. I have shewed out of St. *Austin*, who there calleth this relying on the Churches Authority, *The most true & inviolable Rule of Faith*. And S. *Chrysostome* there also saith, *That these unwritten Traditions of the Church (infallible onely in her Authoritie) are as worthy of faith and credit, as that which is written in Scripture*. And in the 19th. Numb. I have shewed out of St. *Irenæus*, That we should have bin as much obliged to believe although no Scriptures had been written, as we are now, and that the faith of whole Nations is grounded not in Scripture, but consequently on the infallible Authority of the Church, whose word he calleth the Word of God, as I shewed in the end of the 22th. Number. I summe up all these Authorities, that my Adversary may not say (as he did) that the authority of St. *Austin* was single, when he believed the Gospel to be Gods Word upon the infallible authority of the Church: for if her authority be by so many Fathers acknowledged infallible, then St. *Austin* is not single in his opinion in this point.

26. But because that place of St. *Austin* speaketh home, and because my Adversary saith, *That if we take this passage by it self, it seemeth to speak high*, but saith he, *if we consider the tenour of Saint* Austins *discourse in the whole chapter, It is like we will begin to think that it came from him in some heat of spirit to overcome his Adversary*. For these causes (I say) I will consider the tenour of St. *Austins* Discourse in this whole

whole Chapter, and I will shew manifestly, that this his Doctrine was so far *from coming out from him in some heat of Spirit to overcome his adversary*, that he maketh it the very prime Ground of his discourse; and without he will stand to that Ground, he there must needs seem to say nothing against his Adversary. This Chapter is the fourth Chapter, *Cont. Ep. Manichei.* The whole substance of it is this; *The Epistle of* Manichæus *beginneth thus*, Manichæus *the Apostle of Jesus Christ, by the Providence of God the Father. I ask therefore*, saith Saint Austin *who this* Manichæus *is? You will answer, the Apostle of Christ. I do not believe it. Perhaps you will read the Gospel unto me, endevouring thence to prove it. And what if you did fall upon one who did not as yet believe the Gospel, what would you do then, if such an one said I do not believe you?* This is his first Argument, to shew that his Adversary by citing Texts out of the Gospel to prove *Manichæus* a true Apostle, could prove nothing against those, who as yet have not believed the Gospel: then he goeth on; But because I am not one, who have not yet believed the Gospel, and so this Answer cannot serve me, notwithstanding, I must tell you, that I am such an one, that *I would not believe the Gospel, without the Authority of the Catholick Church did move me.* This being the ground of his Answer, you shall see how he builds upon this, and onely this Ground. It followeth then thus; *I having therefore obeyed those* (Catholique Pastors) *saying, Believe the Gospel* (the most Important point of Points) *Why should I not obey them saying to me, do not believe Manichæus?* Then upon this ground he presseth home, saying, *Chuse which you will; if you say believe the Catholiques, then I must not believe you, for they teach me not to give Faith to you: Wherefore believing them (as I do) I cannot believe you. Now, if you say, do not believe the Catholiques, then you do not go consequently to force me by the Gospel to give Faith to Manichæus.* Why so? Mark if his ground be not as I told you, *Be-*

*cause* (saith he) *I have believed the Gospel it selfe upon the preaching of the Catholiques.* Can he more clearly ground upon the Infallible Authority of their teaching, then upon this, to believe the Gospel it selfe? He goeth on thus: Again, *If you hold to the Gospel, my hold shall still be on the Authority of that Church, upon whose Authority I believed the Gospel. I* (saith he) *will hold my self to those, by whose teaching I have believed the Gospel, and these commanding me, I will not believe thee.* And Saint *Austin* goeth so far upon this Ground, as a Ground Infallible, that he saith, *If perhaps you* Manichæans *can find me any clear place in the Gospel to prove that Apostleship of* Manichæus, *that then indeed they shall weaken the Authority of the Catholiques.* But what do you think will follow? I pray note it well. *Their Authority being weakned* (and shewed once fallible) *now neither can I so much as believe the Gospel.* And why so? Because *upon the Authority of these Catholiques, I had believed the Gospel.* The ground of his belief in the Gospel, was their Infallible authority, as not onely these, but also the next words shew manifestly. *Wherefore* (saith he) *if in the Gospel, there be found nothing, that is evident to prove the Apostleship of* Manichæus, *then I will believe the Catholiques rather then You. But if You shall read me out of the Gospel something that is evident to prove* Manichæus *an Apostle, then I will neither believe the Catholiques nor thee.* Why so? *I will not believe the Catholiques, because they* (whose Doctrine I thought Infallible) *have lyed to me concerning your* Manichæans: *But I will not believe thee even when thou citest clear Scripture* (for of this case he speaketh) and why so? *Because thou dost cite me that scripture, to which Scripture I had now believed upon their Authority who have lyed unto me.* Thus he. Could he more clearly say, that if once in one single Lye, he should finde the Churches Authority to be fallible, he should then have left unto him, no Infallible Ground at all, upon which he were to believe Scripture. To deliver a Doctrine thus inculcated over and over again, and

and thus still relying on this one Ground, is far, and very far from letting a word slip in heat of disputation. And therefore (to speak plainly) my Adversary could not deal sincerely, when he said, *If we considered the whole Chapter we should be of his minde*: for nothing can make us lesse of his minde, then to consider the whole Chapter, as I have faithfully done, excepting one little parcel in the end, which most strongly confirmes all I have said; for it followeth, but God forbid I should not believe the Gospel (having so Infallible Authority for it, as the Church is) *yet believing this Gospel, I do not see, how I can believe thee* (teaching me *Manicheus* to be an Apostle:) for we know which Apostle it was, who was chosen in the place of *Judas* the Traytor; *This we have read in the Acts of the Apostles.* And because the *Manichæans* did not believe the *Acts* of the Apostles, he addeth, *which Book* (of the *Acts*) *I must necessarily believe, if I believe the Gospel.* And why? *Because the Catholique Authority doth in like manner commend both these Scriptures to me.* See here again most evidently he saith, the Ground upon which he believeth the *Acts* of the Apostles, as well as he believed the other Scriptures to be the self-same *Catholique Authority*, which in one and the same manner commendeth both Scriptures to us to be believed. Had he said, that he believed this or any other Scripture for the Light he received by the reading of it, by which he discovered it to be Canonical, then the *Manichæans* might as easily have said, that by the like Light we clearly discover the Gospel of *Manichæus* to be Canonical. Thus I have given a large and most faithful account of this Chapter, setting most of it down word for word. And this last place, as also many other, quite overthrow what my Adversary saith, that he spoke here of himself, as now a *Manichæan*: for you see he speaketh of himself, as one believing the *Acts* of the Apostles, and believing it by a necessary consequence, because he hath already believed the other Canonical Books upon the same

same Authority of the Church. And if upon this Authority I may with St. *Austin* believe the whole Scripture to be Gods Word from the beginning to the ending, though it containeth so many strange Stories, & such a world of several points, why may I not upon the same Infallible Authority believe Prayers to Saints, Prayer for the dead and other like points? Neither can it be said, that St. *Austin* (as my Adversary saith) was settled in the belief of the Scripture for the authority of Scripture it self, for I have given you his plain words to the contrary, saying, *that the Authority* (of the Church) *being weakned, he cannot now so much as believe the Gospel*, which he might still do if he believed it for it self, and not merely for the Infallible Authority of the Church: yea, (*l. de Utilit. Cred. cap.* 14.) he saith, that *his belief in Christ was grounded upon that Authority*, which certainly he must then needs hold for Infallible. If he did thus and was never noted for singularity in his faith for doing thus, why may not I prudently doe what he did? Yea, how can I poor simple creature, not doe imprudently, if I refuse to do, what he did, who understood the Scriptures as well as any man the Church had?

27. Having now shewed the Church to be the Judge appointed by Christ for all Controversies, and that the Definition of this Judge is Infallible, and consequently a sufficient ground for Faith, I will now show that all this Doctrine must be applyed to the Roman Church, and cannot be applyed to the Protestant Church. For first this Protestant Church doth not so much as lay claim either to have any such Authority as being Judge in all Points of Controversie, or to the having any infallible Authority. If either of these belonged to her, she would know her own right, from which she now disclaims; and so by her own doctrine she cannot be Judge, or infallible; for so as an Infallible Iudge, she should judge her self to be fallible No more need to be said to exclude her or any other Church, acknowledging by evident and infallible Scripture

(as

(as they profeſs) their own fallibility, and that they are not Iudges in Controverſies, being infallibly fallible, and ſo uncapable of theſe Priviledges, as is Evident. And even this might ſerve to exclude all other Churches, but the *Roman*. She onely claimeth (as ſhe is bound to do) her due right to be Judge in all Controverſies, and her infallible authority to decide them with truth. All other Churches of all other Religions doe ſay indeed, that they are themſelves the onely true Churches, but none of them ſay themſelves to be either the Judges of Controverſies, or to be infallible. Wherefore they cannot be either judges, or infallible; for if they be true Judges, then they judge truly againſt themſelves, when they judge it to be as certain as Scripture, that there is no Judge but Scripture; And if they be truly infallible in defining them, they truly and by infallible authority define themſelves to be fallible, whileſt they define it to be Scripture, that the true Church is fallable. Wherefore infallibly they are fallible, and conſequently infallibly they are not the true Church, which we have demonſtrated to be infallible, and all thoſe Texts, authorities and Reaſons muſt needs prove all Churches falſe that be fallible, whileſt they prove the true Church neceſſarily to be infallible: But all Churches beſides the *Roman*, by their own faith are according to infallible Scripture, fallible. None of them therefore is the true Church. If then the *Roman* Church be not the true Church, then Chriſt hath no true Church left on Earth, nor hath not had theſe many Ages.

Hence you may gather, why I never was ſollicitous to prove all that was ſaid of the Church by the Scriptures and Fathers to be ſaid of the *Roman* Church: for whileſt I did ſhew them to be ſaid of ſuch a Church as might be of an Authority infallibile and ſufficient to ground Faith; It followed manifeſtly, that all was ſaid of the *Roman*, no other being Infallible, and ſo Chriſt ſhould have no true Church, if this be not a true one: For I have demonſtrated, that no other can be Infallible. This being a Demonſtration, un-

til this Argument be anſwered, I hold my ſelf bound to ſay no more, yet I muſt needs tell you in brief a ſmall part of that, which I can and will ſay, if this point be again preſſed: I will ſhew how unanimouſly the Fathers acknowledge this, St. *Cyprian* (*Ep. 3. l. 1.*) ſaith, *that falſe Faith cannot have Acceſs to the* Roman *Church.* St. *Hierome* (*in 1. ad Tim.*) calleth *Damaſus* the Pope of *Rome, The Rector of the Houſe of God,* which St. *Paul* calleth *the Pillar and Foundation of truth.* And in his Epiſtle to the ſame Pope, he ſaith, *To your Holineſs,* that is, *to the Chair of* Peter, *I am joyned in communion: Upon this Rock I know the Church to be built. He that gathers not with thee, ſcatters.* So the Fathers in the Councel of *Chalcedon,* at the voice of St. *Leo* Pope of *Rome,* ſaid, *Peter hath ſpoken by the mouth of Leo.* And many ſuch other places I will alledge, for which now I remit you to *Stapleton* and *Bellarmine,* who both ſhew moſt diligently how all other Churches have gone to *Rome* to receive judgement in their chief Cauſes. See this done in all Ages, in *Bell. 3. De Verbo Dei, c. 6.* I will ſhew alſo how all Churches of all Ages, which were not confeſſed Heretical or Schiſmatical Churches, have been ever joyned in communion to the *Roman* until St. *Gregory* the greats time, and then ever ſince; and how in his time *England* received the ſame *Roman* Faith, which now all *Roman* Catholiques profeſſe, and all Proteſtants deny. And I will ſhew that this faith then brought into *England* from *Rome,* did not in any point of Faith controverted between the *Roman* Catholiques and the Proteſtants, differ from that undoubted true Apoſtolical Faith, which our old *Brittains* received from *Rome,* in the ſecond age of the Church in the dayes of *Eleutherius*; and from hence the preſent *Roman* Churches communion in Doctrine with the Ancient Apoſtolical Church will appear. I will ſhew that perpetual viſibility agreeth onely to the *Roman* Church, and conſequently, that in her onely that Propheſie concerning Chriſt was fulfilled, *That he ſhould reigne in the Houſe of* Jacob *for*

*ever*

*ever, and of his reign there shall be no end.* We can shew how he hath reigned here by known and manifest Pastors of the Church, who have in all ages appeared in Councils to govern his Church. I pray let us but know the name of one of your Pastors, Doctors or Preachers in those last thousand ages, which preceded *Luther*. All are bound to be of the true Church, but to be of an invisible Church, having onely Invisible Pastors administring Sacraments in an invisible manner, no man can be bound to be of. I will shew that all conversions of Nations from Idolatry (so often promised to be made by the true Church) were all and every one of them made by such, as did communicate with the *Roman* Church; and no one Nation ever converted from Paganisme by those who professed Protestant Religion, or held these points in which Protestants differ from us. I will add also, that all who have been eminent for sanctity of Life, or glory of Miracles, have all been joyned in communion to the *Roman* Church; and you cannot name any one famous in either of these respects, whom you can prove to have been a Protestant, a most evident sign of the Truth of the *Roman* Church. Compare any other Church to it in all these points here mentioned, and you shall see all incomparably more verified in the *Roman* Church, then in any other differing from her, or agreeing with you, yea verified in none but her.

I have then I hope performed my Promise to shew a clear way, how in the midst of so many Religions, to find the true One by the Infallible Authority of the Catholick Church, which I have shewed to be the Judge in all Controversies of Faith, and of Authority sufficient to ground true Faith upon, and that when all this is done, *This is that holy and direct way, so direct unto us, that fools cannot erre by it*, and wise men must erre, if they walk not by it. 29.

# The Concluſion,

## *Shewing the Reply to my Papers to have been fully anſwered in the former Diſcourſe.*

This Reply conſiſteth of Eight Anſwers, with a word or two at the end, and at the beginning of theſe Anſwers.

*To all theſe in Order.*

FIrſt at the beginning, you ſay there is little reaſon for you to rejoyn, becauſe I wave the Application of my diſcourſe, as to the *Roman* Church. I anſwer, That my Poſition was, that the Church is the Ground of Faith: Of the *Roman* Church, it was to no end to ſpeak, until I had been firſt granted that ſome Church or other was the Ground of Faith. A man muſt firſt prove to a *Few*, that the Meſſias is come, and then he muſt prove that Chriſt was this Meſſias. Again, all my Proofs proved an infallible Church to be the ground of Faith, of which no fallible Church could be a ſure Ground, as is manifeſt: But all Churches but the *Roman* Church, do profeſs according to Scripture themſelves to be fallible; whence it followeth, that all Churches (but the *Roman*) muſt needs be fallible. For if they or any of them be infallible, then they teach the infallible Truth, when they teach themſelves to be fallible. No Church therefore can be Infallible, but ſhe who teacheth her ſelf to be Infallible. Conſequently, when I proved the Infallible Churches Authority to be the ground of Faith, I proved the Authority of the *Roman* Church to be ſo. See this fully anſwered, Numb. 27. 28.

Secondly, You ſay you might ſtill have left me to anſwer your firſt Paper with the ſecond Paper. I reply, that this is onely to ſtand to what you have ſaid, as I alſo do. Let the Reader judge with indifferency.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, You say, I conclude not contradictorily. I reply, that I alwayes conclude the Churches Authority to be a sufficient ground of Faith, you say, it is an insufficient ground. Reader, judge whether these two be not Contradictions, sufficient and insufficient.

## *Now to your Eight Answers in Order.*

In your first Answer, you spent seven pages to prove the Scripture to be a sufficient ground of Faith. This, This it is, not to conclude contradictorily. You should conclude, that the Church cannot be a sufficient ground of Faith; which still may be, and is true, though it also be most true, that the Scripture is a most sufficient ground of Faith, when it is once known by an infallible Authority to be Gods Word, and also when we evidently know, that such and such is the undoubted sense of the Scripture. But I have proved at large, that we cannot know upon infallible Authority, which books be or be not Gods Word, but by the Authority of an infallible Church. See Numb. 11, & 12. And consequently, if the Churches Authority be not a sufficient ground for Faith, then we can have no Faith to believe, which books be Gods Word, which not, See Numb. 26. The Churches authority is hence proved to be a sufficient ground for Faith, and to be our first ground: for we must first upon the authority of the Church believe such and such Books to be Gods Word; and then assured by this our belief that they be Gods Word, we may ground our Faith upon the authority of that Word of God, which in this sense I hold to be a most sufficient ground for all Faith, extended to all points clearly contained in Scripture. This and onely this all your Authorities prove. Take for an Example, your first Authority of St. *Irenæus*, out of which you neither do nor can infer any more, then, that the Scripture (once believed to be Gods Word) is to us a sufficient ground of Faith, be-

cause

dause in it self it is *the Pillar and Foundation of Truth*: but by the Authority of Saint *Paul* (which is a stronger Authority then that of Saint *Irenæus*) *The Church is the Pillar and Foundation of Truth*: Therefore her Authority is a sufficient ground of Faith, even according to this your strong Argument. This I shewed, Numb. 22. Yea, Saint *Irenæus* expresly teacheth, that though there were no Scripture at all, yet we should all be bound to believe what we now believe, as I have shewed Numb. the 19. And yet then we should have no other Authority, then that of the Church. Again, the Scriptures can then onely ground Faith when they contain the Matter about which we are bound to have Faith; but very often they do not contain this Matter, as I have shewed, Numb. 9. 10, 11, 12. and chiefly Numb. 15. and 16. These points not being contained in Scripture, how can I believe them for the Scripture? Lastly, the Authority of Scripture onely can ground Faith in those points, which are known undoubtedly to be delivered in such clear Texts, as a man cannot prudently doubt of the sence; but a number of things are to be believed, which be not thus set down in Scripture, as hath been shewed in the places cited. See also Numb. 14. In other Cases I never deny the Scripture to be the ground of Faith, but I say, that as God spoke by the pens of those who writt Scripture, so he speaketh by the Tongue of his Church in a General Council; and therefore these his words are also to be believed, as I fully shewed, Numb. 21. 22, 23, 24, 25, 26. The Scripture in the Cases I here specified, is a sufficient ground of Faith, as your authorities well prove, and so is the authority of the Church, as I have fully proved in the places cited.

In your second Answer, all you say is, that the Church cannot ground our Faith, but I have fully shewed the contrary in the places cited.

In your third Answer, you come to answer the Testi-

monies

monies I brought out of Holy Fathers and Scriptures, and this taketh you up unto your 27. Page. My Reply is, that in this Paper I have made good Authorities and Testimonies sufficiently abundant to convince what I undertook, and I have fully refuted the chief things you said against the chief places, as may appear fully out of the Numb. 17, 19, 22, 23, 24, 25, & 26. where at large I have shewed your lesse sincere proceeding about the prime authority of S. *Austin*, whose authority in the precedent Number I shewed not to be single.

In the fourth Answer, you say you take not Canonical Books to be Canonical for the authority of the Church. I Reply, that if you do not take them to be so on this authority, yet the holy Fathers did, as I have shewed Numb. 12. 25, 26. And if you believe them to be Canonical onely upon the Light given in them to you to see this verity, your ground is far more fallible then the authority of a General Council, as I have demonstrated Numb. 13.

In the fifth Answer, you endevour to shew, that you ground not your Faith on your own private judgement of discretion, but I have shewed fully the contrary, Nu. 3, 4, 7.

In the sixt Answer, you rejoyce to see me confesse the Scripture to be the Rule of Faith and Manners, as if I had at any time denyed this. Neither doth this Confession destroy my Position, that the Church is the Ground of our Belief. Can I not ground my Faith upon what St. *Peter* saith, because I can ground it upon that which Saint *Paul* saith? Why is the Scripture the Rule of Faith? Because it delivereth to me Gods Written Word. But the Church delivereth to me Gods Word written and unwritten, I may therefore also rule my self by that. The most right Rule of Scripture is often so crookedly applyed, that he is blind who seeth not that we need to have better security of Interpretation, then our own private discretion of Judgement can afford, as I have fully proved Num. 4. 14.

Of

Of the Infallibility of the Church in Interpreting, I have fully proved our Doctrine, Numb. 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26.

In the seventh Answer, you taxe me with being loath to own the Roman Church. Why I did not speak of the Roman Church, I told you here in the beginning, it was because you would conclude as there you do, The Catholique Church is not the Ground of Faith, therefore the Roman is not. I have fully shewed the contrary, and proved the Catholique Church to be the ground of our Faith; and out of superabundance I have shewed this Church to be the Roman Church. See Numb. 27, 28.

In the eighth Answer, you charge me in differing from my selfe, because before I taught the ground of Believing to be the Authority of the Church, and now I say, it is the Authority of God Revealing. My Reply is exceeding easie. The Ground of our Faith is God Revealing, and God Revealing by his Church: as he first causeth our first Belief, when he tells us by his Church such and such Books are Infallibly his Word. God Revealing is alwaies the formal object of Faith, but sometimes God Revealeth his minde by Scriptures, and sometimes by the Church, as he did for two Thousand yeares and more, before the Scriptures were written. The Prophets before they did write, did say, *This saith the Lord*, to wit, this he said by their Mouths: So say I, *This and this saith our Lord* by the Mouth of his Church; as I have shewed Numb. 22. Saint *Athanasius* to speak, and I have shewed, Numb. 28. The General Councel of *Chalcedon* to have said *Peter hath spoken by the mouth of Leo* Pope of *Rome*. And thus Gods Revelation cometh to us by the Church: She and onely She teacheth us these and these Scriptures to be Gods Word. We must first believe her, before we can come to have Infallible Ground to believe Scriptures, as I have fully shewed. After we have believed Scripture, we cannot by Scripture onely know the undoubted sense of many

necessary places in Scripture, as hath been shewed. Again, all things necessary to be believed, be not set down in Scripture, as hath also been shewed fully. The Revelation of God coming to us in all these cases by the Church, you by your own words, in this place, must grant her Authority to be our ordinary cause of Faith.

At the end of these your Answers, you would fain seem to have spoken properly in accusing us of Excesse of Faith: But your distinction doth no way salve the Impropriety of the Speech; for there is still a difference in *more* believing Objects, and believing *more* Objects: but granting that it may be improperly spoken, yet even in that Sense it is not truly said, because there can be no Excesse of Faith in believing what God saith; for believing upon an Infallible Authority all that we believe, we cannot believe more then we should, if we believe no more things, then be grounded upon that Infallible Authority (as we do not:) And consequently we do no more, then believe such things as have for their Warrant; *This saith the Lord.*

Having now answered your Paper from the beginning to the end, I am most willing to take your own close out of Saint *Austin*, *Against Reason, no sober Man will go against Scriptures no Christian, against the Church no Peace-maker*; adding his other words (*Tr.* 32. *in Joan.*) *Let us believe my Brethren, so much as a Man loveth the Church, just so much he hath of the Holy Ghost.*

SIR,

*SIR,*

I Cannot answer it to God, nor to his Church with us, if I let you seem to your self, or to others of your perswasion, that you have the Victory, until you have overcome your Error; therefore you will excuse me if I still follow you.

To your Preface then. If the Roman Catholiques have often foretold, that by permitting freely to all sorts of people the reading of the Scriptures in their Mother-tongue, multitudes of new Sects and Heresies would not fail to grow up in numberlesse number; and as for the peoples Manners, they would grow worse and worse (as you say in the beginning) then are your Roman Catholiques, in this, false Prophets; because they seem (by you) to make that the cause of Heresies and bad Manners. This is plainly *fallacia non causæ*, or the fallacy of accident. And secondly, it is contrary to that of our Saviour Christ, Saint *Mark* the 12. 24. *Do you not therefore erre, not knowing the Scriptures, and the power of God?* By our Saviour, the knowledge of the Scriptures is not the cause of erring, but the not knowing of the Scriptures is the cause of erring: *You do therefore erre not knowing the Scriptures, which are able to make us wise unto Salvation*; as Saint *Paul* to *Timothy*, 2 *Tim.* 3. 15. And thirdly, You confesse in this Paper, that when we are by the Church assured that the Scripture is the Word of God, we may Ground our Faith in it, for those things which are plainly delivered. And fourthly, How cometh it to passe then, that some of those, in whom

Infal-

Infallibility (as you think) is vested, have been Hereticks and lewd: the former of which, indeed you do much deny, but is exemplified in *Liberius*'s subscribing against *Athanasius*, as you may see fully proved by our *Reinalds* against your *Hart*. And surely was that also an action of bad Manners. Therefore if your Church were the true Church, yet doth it not (you see) teach the way of Salvation infallibly, and therefore can we not by it infallibly discerne the true Religion from the false. Indeed the Catholick Church hath taught the infallible way of Salvation; but that was the Scripture, as I proved by many Testimonies; and this was a teaching the infallible way by consequence, because it did teach the Scripture, which is the infallible way: yet hath it not in particular points, taught the infallible way infallibly. Neither are we by the Church infallibly resolved, that the Scripture is the Word of God, although the authority of the true Church be a motive herein, yet is it not that wherein ultimately we ground our Faith of the Scriptures, as I have shewed.

Whereas then you say that we cannot have, as things stand, any other assurance to ground our Faith upon securely (namely then the Church) you do still but *fortiter suppenere*, for we cannot ground our assurance securely upon the Church. And secondly, Whereas you say, that as things stand, we have no other assurance, &c. you do not well consider what you say, or I do not understand what you mean: for hereby you do intimate that the Church is not the ground of our Faith, κατ' ἐξοχὴν, but that which is indeed the ground of our Faith, must be so absolutely and universally, as farre as is necessary: the Church security is but the best of the kinde, amongst those which are humane; but we must have a Divine indefectible ground for our Divine Faith, in which there cannot be falsity. Neither thirdly, Is the Church the first ground, because by it we believe the Scripture to be the Word of God;

because, if we did by it believe the Scripture, then we are not first to believe it by the Scripture. And if whatsoever credence we do give to it, we do give by authority of the Scripture, then are we first to believe the Scripture, and then that is the first ground. Fourthly, In that you say you did never deny, that when we are by the Infallible authority of the Church assured of the Scripture, to be the Word of God, we may believe such things as are clearly contained in Scripture, &c. you say that which concludes against the practice of the Church, not to permit the use of Scripture unto the People; and also you do abate of the Universal Proposition in the first Paper, that Divine Faith in all things is caused by the proposal of the Church; and therefore if you would hold you to this, the Controversie would be lessened betwixt us: for *dato non concesso*, that we are bound to believe the Scripture to be the Word of God by the authority of the Church, yet when we do thus believe it, then the immediate ground of our Faith in those things clearly set down, is the written Word of God, and not the authority of the Church. So then your first Number is indeed in no Number, for you cannot mean thus, that we cannot believe any thing proposed plainly in Scripture, unless we believe the authority of the Church in that particular. And therefore when you have proved the authority of the Church to be that which causeth and determineth our Faith of Scripture to be the Word of God, you will say lesse then formerly, and untill you do prove it, you say nothing.

As touching the expressions you make, in the second Number, of him who answered the Papers, give him leave, if not to be the adversary herein, yet to differ from you, and to think himself to be one of the most slender Sons of the Church of *England*. Neither did you intend by courteous and respective words to draw him to your opinion. Soft words alone will not do it, but soft words with hard arguments may do more. When we see a clear demon-

demonstration of truth, it is no courtesie to yeild assent, for the Understanding cannot refuse Truth when it doth shew it selfe; But whether the Reply (as you speak) be as clear a demonstration as any wise man can hope for in this matter, let me have the liberty and the civility (if in these businesses it hath any place) not to determine. Only it is very hard to say, who doth *optimum quod sit*, as they speak, the best of the kinde. Yet also wise men may think, that if there can be nothing more expected towards ths defence of your first position, the cause is wanting to it. And certainly such a wise man and ingenuous (as you be) will not content himselfe with any ascertainment, but that which is absolute, and uncapable of Error. Therefore not to deceive you by your own commendations, put it to issue, bring it to the test, try the debate betwixt us by this rule of Wisdome and Conscience also, *Tene quod certum est, relinque quod incertum.* It is certain that the Scripture is Infallible, and you confesse it; it is not certain that the Church is Infallible, and I deny it. Which then should you take to be the Rule and Ground and Cause of Faith?

As for the good designe you mention here, and in your Title, to guide Souls redeemed by Christ to the happy Eternity; I congratulate to you that desire, but I am sorry that such a zeal is better then the way you lead them in. Assuredly those Souls redeemed by the Blood of Christ, may and shall come to happinesse, without any Infallible Judge of Controversies on Earth. For first, those things which are necessary to Salvation are plain in Scripture; matters of question we are in no such danger by the ignorance of, reserving a purpose not to contradict what we shall be convinced in on either part. Secondly, We may be directed in these points by Judges, though not Infallible, as unto the quiet of the Church. Thirdly, Untill your Infallible Judge appears to be truly such, it is the best way not to be bound intuitively to his dictates:

for then we might be in possibility of being bound to believe an errour which is repugnant to the understanding, *Ex natura rei*. So that until you make good the Title of an infallible Judge, whom (as you say) we are obliged under pain of damnation not to disbelieve, I shall *hold up my hand* onely in admiration of your confidence.

And whilest you do demonstrate this, (that we are bound under pain of damnation not to disbelieve this Judge of yours,) You say you do demonstrate your former Position that the infallible Authority of the Catholique Church is the ground of our Faith. So you, yes, because you say that the Catholique Church is the infallible Judge: To this, thus. Is it the infallible Judge whereunto we are bound to submit our understandings in all things, or not? if in all things, then we cannot believe what the Scripture saith in plain points without the proposal of the Church; which now seems contrary to your mind. if not in all things, but onely whether the Scripture be the Word of God, or in cases of Controversie; then do you now go lesse then in your former paper, & against the nature of implicite Faith.

Secondly, that the authority of the Church is not it upon which we resolvedly rest our Faith of the Scripture; or the determination of Controversies, we shall see when you come to it.

Thirdly, what do you mean by the Church? do you understand it formally of the people, or representatively in an Assembly of the Pastors, if you mean it of the people also; how is infallibility vested in them? Are we bound to stand to their judgement? and they are to be in obedience to their Pastors. Well then; it must be understood of their Pastors. What? of all? or most? or one? If of all, when did they all Vote? if of most, when did most Vote? If of one ordinary Pastor, with, or in a General Council; then remember whensoever in your sense you name a Church, it be so taken of the Pope and his Council General, which yet you will

not

not evince to be infallible by their authority. If they were infallible, they must be infallible by the Word of God, as to us; and then that again is the first ground of Faith: and also secondly, you will find that many priviledges which you have spoken of as to the Church, do not belong to the Church Representative strictly, but to all the people of the Church as invisible; which, as such comes not into this Controversie. If then you come again in any discourse, keep you within, and to the bounds of the question; and speak of the authority of the Church in the same sense, as to be the ground of Faith Divine in all points, or in the same particulars. For if you proceed from the Churches being the ground of faith as towards the Scripture to be the Word of God: To conclude, that therefore it is the ground of faith indefinitely or universally, you commit the fallacy *à dicto secundum quid*; as also, if you proceed from its being the ground of Faith in points of Controversie to the being the ground of Faith in all things, the discourse hath the same fault. And yet you say, that in your progresse you leave nothing of concernment in my reply unanswered; and also that you conclude contradictorily to me.

Sir, Let me here use my Liberty for your good. If you had a mind to leave nothing in my reply of moment unanswered, you would have followed me as a disputant, κατ' ἄνδρα; you would have opposed distinction to some incident arguments, (for professedly the answerer is not to dispute.) You would have given me answer to answer, interpretation to testimonies, with shewing either their impertinency or invaliditie. And that excuse of yours, lest you should be *too long*, is surely too short to cover you. That is not long whereof nothing can be abated as he said, and that is my excuse. And surely your Treatise is too long, not only by your many repetitions which swell your paper; but would have been too long, had it been lesse, it is too long by it self. Who ever answered a rejoynder with a

Treatise?

Treatise? Shall I say, that by your form of a Treatise, it may seem that you have more mind to treat then to fight, I am loath to be so bold; neither doth it become my spirit to tell you that you do not stand your ground; but you do not neither conclude contradictorily, if your Treatise did prove that the authoritie of your Church is the ground of Faith in the Divinitie of the Scripture, and in case of Controversie: For your first paper spoke universally, my Answer denied it, and now you would prove it if you could particularly. If you would conclude contradictorily to me, you should have concluded in the same quantitie affirmatively to my negative. This you here seem not to intend, yet in other parts of your Treatise you would contend it.

And in the end you would arm your Treatise against me, as if there were no difference betwixt Positive and Oppositive Divinity. And this you doe by references, but you should not have put the suit to reference without my consent.

*So much for the Preface.*

After the Preface you come to the Proof of the Title.

You mean the Title of this Paper, which surely needs not to be proved, because it is not delivered by way of Affirmation, but of Disquisition.

AND as for the Similitude (you say) of St. *Anselme*, we like it very well. For, if the Tables be turned, it doth very aptly belong to you; who if you have not with a *Roman* contention for Mysterie pulled out the Eyes of Men, yet have put out the Light, not allowing them the use of the Scripture: you shut up the people in Darkness and will not let them see *the Sun of Righteousnesse in his own Orb of Scripture*, for fear it may be he should not seem now to rise, but to go down in *Rome*: and instead hereof you leave Men to walk by the Light of the *Pope*; whom one compared

pined to the Sun, as the Emperour to the Moon. Christ saith, Search the Scriptures, you say not so, you take away the use of all humble seeking of God for the knowledge of Truth, because you have said that we must all submit our assents to the determinations of the Church. So you see how your Opinion is practically impious, and is disagreeable to your own directions, for you say, if they should seek (of God) they should find. Onely you say, we should set all passions & prejudices aside, & with a calm humble mind beg of God to give us this grace of seeking truth.

Surely, this Qualification of our address to God for the finding of Truth is very good, and I would it were as well practised as delivered: but let the world judge who is like to be most wanting in this Devotion, and to exceed in passion and prejudice. He who affirms all to be delivered infallibly by the Church, or he that searcheth in Scripture particular Truths of Infallibility pretended easily, makes any man passionate against difference, unless indeed he could make it good. And he that is infallible is in right capacitie sure to have a necessary prejudice against *different Opinions*. Neither since the times of the Apostles hath humilitie been usually seen to keep company with infallibilitie; not that he who is most humble is not most likely not to erre, but that he who saith he cannot erre is most likely not to be humble. But as for prejudice by Education, which you speak of also, may I not as well retort it upon you? I think in some respects it is not so applicable to me. Indeed we do not inherit Religion as Lands: but if, when we come to abilitie of discerning (which your Religion in its Principles will never let you come to) we see good cause for our Religion, Surely we have no reason to leave it, because it was our Fathers, although we doe not embrace it, because it was our Fathers. The relation it hath to our Ancestours hath no more moment in it then the Church may have upon you, namely, to be a considerable motive, not to be your ultimate resolution, thus for the

first number of your proof, but this is not sufficient to be even with you for the slighting us by laying of Bellarmine in his *Antitheses* at the end of the 5 chapter, *Certum est species facile concurrere, ut, quæ non videbat, quæ sunt, & videre videtur quæ non sunt.* So, while you do not see what exceptions there are against you, you seem to see what are not exceptions against us, and our way of Faith.

But therefore in your second Number you will prove your way by Scripture. We now come to it. And your Text is, *Esay* the 35. From the fourth Verse to the ninth, by parcels, *Say to the fainthearted, take heed, and fear not; behold, God himself will come and save you: then shall the eyes of the blind be lightned, and the eares of the Deaf be opened, and there shall be a path, and a way, and it shall be called an Holy way, and this shall be unto you a direct way, so that fools cannot erre by it.* Thus you order the Testimony.

To this we say, 1. Whether it be intended by the Holy Ghost to respect the Primitive Church Christian mystically, through the Jewish, we cannot be certain: but sure we may be, that in the Letter it doth respect the Jewish Church, after their redemption from captivity. And therefore it may be, you fearing that this should be taken notice of, do wisely leave out those passages, which may seem to incline the Text to that sense, and you take only that which you think is for your turn. So you know who would have deceived Christ, by omitting that part of Scripture which was against him; although you will not allow to the people the liberty of Scripture, yet let us have all for our use in the dispute. And if there be a mystical sense here, yet you know the rule of Divines, which is also not denyed by yours, that mystical Divinity is not argumentative, unlesse namely the mystical sense be expressed in Scripture, which you are here to demonstrate.

2. If it be understood of the Primitive Church, through the Jewish (as Saint *Hierome* indeed doth com-

ment

merit upon it; yet will it not follow, that unless you can prove, that whatsoever privileges were promised to the first Church in the times of the Apostles, should in full dimensions be always extended to your Church, and your Church only.

Therefore your *Isidor Clarius* doth apply this Text to the time of our Saviour, when he did make the Blind to See, the Lame to Walk, as the same word to *Salim* the Baptist: And therefore since it was signally accomplished then, we cannot urge the performance of it to the equality in a fuller measure; which also seems to be acknowledged by Saint *Hierome* upon the place; where the opening of the Eares of the Deaf, he doth apply to the Scripture Preached, and the way he takes to be such: How then, as we cannot solidly argue from the promise of pouring out the gift of the Holy Spirit, which was (plenarie and *substantialiter, visibili*) made good upon the Apostles (as both *Peter* declared) that there shall be the like effusion of immediate gifts upon the Church in the following Ages; which some Sectaries would plead: So neither can we rationally conclude from this promise, which was in that excellent manner, and in the Letter performed by our Saviour Christ, that it shall be conferred on any Church in that measure of a spiritual kind. If we cannot evince the same perfection in the same kinde, surely can we not by our accommodation of sense, evince the same perfection in another kind. Upon the former consideration, because it is mystical, and drawn not argumentatively: this is the way, this path, and this way, and this holy way, that fools cannot erre, is (upon supposition) promised to the Church; Is it not? Well then, if it be promised to the Church, then the Church is not that way, for that way is promised to the Church; so that the Church is not absolutely that way, but so far as it goeth that way, which is pertinent as was said before (and is not yet answered) that the Church is *regula regulata*, not *regulans*. Take then the matter thus;

what way which the Church goes we must go. The Church goes by the way of Gods Word revealed, and so must we, therefore we are not bound to follow the Church with blind obedience, which includes Faith, because that includes Knowledge, although it be contradistinguished to Science.

Fourthly, If the promise did belong to the Church in all times, yet not to any Church of one denomination, therefore until you can prove that your Church is all, this makes nothing for you. Particular Churches have not those properties which belong to the Universal Church as such.

And if you make a proof of the Church to be the holy way, because the Church is holy, how easily is that undone, because there is more reason that the Scripture should be the holy way, for that is perfectly holy: for the Holy Ghost is the Judge, because he is essentially holy, but neither is the Church perfectly holy here, nor essentially holy not in Heaven: And besides, secondly, the Holy Church (if you understand it with relation to the Creed, as in your former Paper) is to be taken of the Church invisible, which as such is no way. And thus I have slighted your strong hold, as it seems to you, for hitherto you do fly very often.

In your third Number you come to an assertion of the necessity of an Infallible Judge.

You say, that all Christians of whatsoever Religion do agree in this, that there must be one Judge of all Controversies and Doubts, which either be, or can be in Religion. So you.

You speak very largely of your supposition, as if it were agreed to by all Christians, but you do not consider that you do leave out that which makes the question, the state of the question, whether there must be an Infallible Judge on Earth, for that is not consented to on all hands, by all Religions, indeed by none but yours.

That God either essentially taken, or personally the Holy Ghost is the Supreme, Universal, Infallible Judge, and onely in whose Authority we rest, and whose word is the Ground of Faith, we hold. Under him subordinate Judges there are, but not Infallible: neither is it by your reason sufficiently confirmed, that there should be on Earth any Infallible Judge. For the defect of such a Judge on Earth doth not leave us free without any fault to follow our own private judgement, in holding what we will. For first, it is impossible for us to hold what we will, in our judgements. We may possibly, though not morally, professe what we will, although contrary to our judgements, as many doe: but we cannot assent to what we will, because our Understanding is not free to take which part of the opposition it pleaseth by way of Will, for it embraceth Truth naturally, as it sees it, and it cannot give a rational assent without a due conviction, and therefore your implicite Faith is false and null.

Secondly, We do not say that we should follow our own judgement of discretion, without meanes of regulating our judgement: but yet after we have perused the Definitions of Councils, and Sentences of the Fathers, we cannot resigne up our Assents to their Dictates upon their account, but do examine them, (as the *Bereans* did that which Saint *Paul* said) untill we can finde them resolved into the Infallible rule of Holy Scripture. For let me ask a Papist, according to the tenour of your first Paper, What doth he believe? he answers, that which the Church believeth: and why doth he believe it? because the Church believeth it: and why doth the Church believe it? because it received it from the first Church, through the Sentences of the Fathers, or the Determinations of Councils. Well, but how shall the People know, whether this Tradition of Doctrine is truly discerned, and faithfully delivered? but if so, why is he bound to believe the first Church? because either they

were the Apostles, or had it from the Apostles. And why doth he believe the Apostles? Because they were inspired by the Holy Ghost. Well, in what they wrote, or in what they spoke, or both? In both. Well, but how do we know what they spoke? We know what they wrote bears witnesse of it self; so doth not so what they spoke. So that although they were inspired in what they spoke, yet we know not what they spoke. Neither can we be assured by a Divine Faith, that what of them was not written is certainly derived. And therefore all of Faith must be terminated, and determined in that which is written.

And as towards Controversies, we say thirdly, that Christ hath sufficiently provided for the Salvation of Man, in regard of means of knowledge, without an Infallible Judge on Earth of their Controversies: because things necessary are plainly set down in Scripture; and for matters of question, we are not in any such danger, if we do our endevour according to our condition, to finde out Truth, and do dispose our selves to Belief, as we shall see credibility to arise. The Scripture doth with competent clearnesse furnish us against damnative error, and the Church doth no more, as you give us to understand at the end of this your Treatise: and why then should we leave the Scripture (which is acknowledged Infallible) to go to the Church? and what need then of an Infallible Judge? what for Peace and Unity?

Then fourthly, we say that the Decisions of the Church though unprovided of infallibilitie, do yet oblige unto Peace. Though their judgement cannot ingage undisputed assent: yet their power they have from Christ, doth require reverence and undisturbance in the different. It requires subscription, if we see no cause of dissenting; and if we do, subjection to the censure. All the authoritie of the world can go no further with us; unlesse we might be hypocrites in suffering by an outward act from our inward

act of belief. And yet wherein have we divided our accords from the former General Councils? And therefore why are we charged with this Indictment, as if we were opposite to the authoritie of the truly Catholique Church: yea if we did differ without Opposition, we keep the peace of the Church without question. And that we must differ until we see God speaking, believe his reason that said, *Omnis creata veritas, &c.* All created veritie is defectible, unlesse as it is rectified by the increased veritie: Wherefore the assent neither to the Testimonie of Men or Angels doth infallibly lead into Truth, save onely so far as they see the Testimonie of God speaking in them. So then the assent of Faith is onely under obedience to him speaking. And if you say that God doth speak in General Councils, as he doth speak in his Word written, prove it. Yea, how then will you avoyd blasphemie? For doth God speak Contradictions? For so one Council hath contradicted another. And to use your own argument, we are bound to submit our judgement onely to those who can judge of the inward act; for so you distinguish betwixt temporal Judges and others; but God only can judge of our internal acts, therefore we must submit our assents onely to him: and therefore to others, no further then they speak according to him. So that we cannot absolutely adhere to whatsoever is said in Councils, which have erred, Jewish and Christian too. Now then you may think I spoke reason in my respects to General Councils without your unlimited subjection of Faith.

And therefore your admiration in the beginning of the 5th. page of this Paper, which is grounded upon your interpretation of that of *Esay*, is as unnecessarie. And that absurditie which you would infer upon my Opinion (that the wisest men in the world are most likely to erre this way by which he may in his interiour judgement go quite contrarie to all Christendome) hath little in it but noise. For first you suppose hereupon an infallible Judge upon earth;

which

which is the Question. Secondly the wiſeſt man is moſt likely to erre if it be lawful to diſſent from Univerſal councils, becauſe as ſuch he is moſt apt to diſcern what is defined according to Truth, what not. Thirdly, what think you of Saint *Athanaſius*, who diſſented in his judgement and profeſſion too, from moſt of Chriſtendome then about the Divinitie of the Sonne. Fourthly, the Rule of Scripture is equally infallible, and thoſe who are wiſe if they prepare themſelves for the ſearch of Truth, they are likely not to erre, (for if they go by the Rule, they cannot erre, becauſe it is infallible: But thoſe who goe by the Church may erre, becauſe for ought is yet proved, it is not infallible) and thoſe who are fools may by Scripture be made wiſe unto ſalvation. And to this purpoſe the Scripture, which is very ſublime and heavenly in the matter, yet is ſimple and plain and low in the manner of deliverie, that thoſe who are of meaner capacitie might hereby be ſufficiently directed to life and ſalvation: Therefore doe not tell me but prove to me that the Church is infallible, and that you are the onely Church, or elſe you do nothing but with fooles, whom you find or make to goe your way.

In your next lines you do diſcharge me of ſingularitie in my Opinion: For it appears by you, that all but *Roman* Catholiques are of the ſame perſwaſion.

All but *Roman* Catholiques, you ſay. As if none were Catholiques but either of your Nation, or of your Religion. The firſt is a contradiction, and the ſecond is a falſitie; for there were many Catholiques which were not of your Religion in thoſe Points wherein we differ. By the Fathers of the Church, thoſe were accounted Catholiques which withſtood the plea of *Fauſtinus* the Popes Legate in the *Carthaginian* Councll, when he falſified the *Nicene* Canon of ſubjection to the *Roman* Biſhop; whereof no ſuch copie could be found. They were Catholiques who determined againſt Appeals to *Rome*, who determined equal

privi-

priviledges of other Churches to the Bishop of *Rome*. They were Catholiques who held not Transubstantiation, nor Purgatory, nor your use of Images, nor your Sacrament under one kind, nor your other Sacraments, as of proper Name, nor Indulgencies. And they were Catholiques, who held that which you doe not hold, as the Millenarie Opinion, and Infant Communion.

And therefore (to follow you) the desperate consequence which you charge us with, if we do not come over to your way, flowes not from your premises, unlesse you can make out an infallible assistance of your See, and that this is by God appointed for our necessarie passage to salvation, and the way promised in the Prophet *Esay*. Nay, if the people should be left, for their guidance to the unanimous consent of the whole Church in points of Faith, here would be a desperate consequence; for I hope they were more like to finde the Articles of Faith in the leaves of Scripture (which as to these is plain) then in the perusal and collection of all the judgements of all the Fathers of all ages every where, according to the rule of *Lyrinensis*; or if we take the depositions of the Fathers in those properties, which he describeth such whereby we are to be ruled, that they must be holy Men, wise Men, they must hold the Catholick Faith and Communion, they must persist in their Doctrine, they must persist in it unto Death in the same sense, as in the 39. Chapter against Heresies. If you do not take the consent of the Church, according to these circumstances you differ from him: If you do, how shall the poor people through all those labyrinths, see the right way of wholsome Doctrine, when who knows how many of them did not write at all? How many of those who wrote were not such? How many works of those who were such are to us perished? How many bastard pieces are fathered on them? How many of their writings corrupted? How many or how few have touched upon our differences, having not occasion by adversaries? How many

have differed from one another? How many have differed from themselves? Is then this the way that fools cannot erre? It wise men go this way, surely this is their first errour, that they go this way; wherein nothing is found but perplexities and unsatisfiednesse. Neither can they soberly raise the credit of their Doctrine by prime descent without interruption from the Apostolique age, if all be well considered. Such a confidence let me give a check to by application of a storie.

A *Christian Prince* was much seduced by a kind of men, who professed a vast Art of giving a certain account of many Ages before; and a trifling Courtier perceiving his humour, made him believe that his Pedegree in antient race of Royal Blood, might be fetched from *Noah*'s Ark: wherewith he being greatly delighted, forthwith laid aside all busnesse, and gave himself to the search of the thing so earnestly, that he suffered none to interrupt him whosoever; no not Embassadours, which were sent to him about most weighty affairs. Many marvelled hereat, but none durst speak their mind; till at length his Cook, whom he used sometimes as his Fool, told him that the thing he went about was nothing for his honour; for now saith he, I worship your Majestie as a God; but if we go once to *Noahs* Arke, we must there your self and I both be akinne.

This the Storie, which is so long, that it reacheth you from top to toe: for you would by a verie long series derive your authoritie as it were from *Noahs* Arke, which you think represents your Church, out of which there is no salvation. You would run it up from verie many successions to the times of the Apostles, and nothing will content you but this ancient Original. You lay aside all other proofs in comparison of this succession; (not so much of Doctrine indeed, as of Church) Embassadours that are sent to you with Scripture you will not hear, unlesse your Church may have the power of Interpretation infallibly in your own

own cause. But let some of the Popes servants whom he makes his Fools, inform him that that which he goes about is little for his Honour; for now they worship *him* as a God, but if they come to the times of the Apostles, there will be found no such distance betwixt him and others; and consanguinitie of Doctrine (as it is expressed) will be able to disinherit your points of difference formerly named, with invocation of Saints ἀπ' αἰῶνος; Where doe we finde them? Where may we read them? Therefore urge not Antiquitie, unlesse Truth goes along with it on your side, and do not any more strain the consent of ages for Doctrines, which (as we may speak) will be out of breath long before they come to that mightie height of the Apostolique time.

As for your instance of Saint *Cyprian* erring by perswasion of that which he held to be Scripture, and St. *Austins Crisis* of his errour; I Answer,

First, You see here Saint *Cyprian*, a Prime Doctor of the Church did then ground his Opinion upon Scripture without recourse to Tradition. And this makes for us, that he thought it no injurie to the Church to varie from what was held or practised upon respect to Scripture. He undertook to think and doe otherwise then Christendome then, in the point of Rebaptization; and yet was not accused as an Heretique.

Secondly, He erred grosse, and yet not dangerously, because he held his Opinion without malignance to the Church: and so may we without peril of salvation. And if you say the case is different betwixt him and us, because that point wherein he went not with the Church, was not then defined by a Council: We answer, what shall we say then of the times in the Church, before there was any Council, and therefore in those times the Rule of Faith and Action was without a Council; and therefore this answer doth not satisfie; or they were ruled only by Scripture, which may satisfie you.

Thirdly, He erred not in the substance of the Act when he pleaded Scripture; but in the misapplication of Scripture to that case: and therefore this Argument comes to the sallacie of accident, and this makes no prejudice against Scripture, which in it self is contrary to errour, without defectibilitie; and therefore he that indeed follows Scripture cannot erre, because it is Infallible. So cannot we say of the Church, for ought yet we see by your Discourse.

Fourthly, This makes no more disadvantage to the prerogative of Scripture, then that the *Pelagians* for their Opinions urged the Testimonies of the Fathers: which caused Saint *Austin* to make an Apologie for them, *Vobis Pelagianis*; when you *Pelagians* were not yet born, the Fathers spake more securely; namely of the power of nature. Nay surely it makes a great deal lesse; for the Father, if in this he had followed the Fathers, whom the *Pelagians* quoted, had erred not by his Interpretation of them, but, it seems, by their inconsiderateneſſe: But we cannot charge Scripture with any such fault; and therefore Saint *Cyprian* erred by misinterprecation. And here also by the way we see how fallible a rule is the consent of the Fathers: since if Saint *Austin* had ordered his belief thereby he had been overtaken with *Pelagianisme*.

Now as for Saint *Austins crisis* concerning this of Saint *Cyprian*, that if he had lived to see the Determination of a plenary Council, he would for his great humilitie and charitie straightway have yielded, and preferred the General Council before his judgement; to this (besides what we now said about the undefinednesse of it by a Council) we say, It is like he would have yielded, and this yet accrews not unto your cause much.

For first, Saint *Austin* sayes for his great humilitie and charitie he would have yielded. And this manner of Expression you may perceive doth abstract from a necessitie of duty. Under bond of Duty these vertues have no freedome. He was so humble of mind that he would have thought

thought better of them: He was so charitable, that for this he would have offended none in this case: but doth this infer that he was bound in conscience to sink his Opinion in the authoritie of their Definition? No, no. Humilitie and Charitie have in them no formalitie influxive unto Faith (for this is seated in the understanding) but no peace. Therefore this yielding of his, (supposed upon the Case) would have onely concerned his person, as not to have opposed here; not his judgement, as if this should necessarily have been overcome by their Authority. For the person may be bound when the Conscience cannot be bound: so may the person yield as to the omission of opposite acts, when the understanding yet keeps its former due apprehension.

Secondly, this businesse of Saint *Cyprian* is such as is a matter of practice not clearly decided by Scripture: but this avails not to an universal conclusion of ruling our faith by the Church; which although you at the beginning did seem to wave, yet here would in your discourse insinuate and wind in. The summe of this is, We do not dispute a reverence to Councils: but we cannot grant an undisputed reception of whatsoever is delivered by them. In such determination we break not the peace; but keep Faith for Gods Word. So then your fourth Number in your sixt page might have been spared, until you had upheld your supposition of construing that of *Esay* to be meant of the Church. All you build thereupon must be ruinous. *Debile fundamentum fallit opus.* And besides what is there but repetitions? Onely you observe therein another inconvenience in our Cause; in that we doe not hold one Infallible Judge on earth, which yet in effect you have had before. But to view the moment thereof the better, let me put what you would have into some form with all ingenuitie; thus, where there is not one Judge there will not be one Faith: but there is one Faith; therefore there is but one Judge.

Now

Now if you will except this Syllogism for yours, I shall answer to it by distinguishing; if you mean in the proposition an Infallible Judge on Earth, and such a Faith as is to be understood in the assumption according to the Text, *Ephes.* 4. 5. then we deny the proposition, for Faith there, is not to be understood of Faith subjectively, but Faith objectively, and Faith, in regard of the objects thereof may be entire, and one, though every one doth not hold them, for the unity of Faith there depends not upon mens profession, but upon coherence with it self, and the exclusion of any other, as towards appointment unto Salvation. If you mean Faith otherwise, we deny your assumption to be true to the sense of the Text.

Whereas you say then, that otherwise God had not well provided for the Salvation of men generally, if but one of ten thousands (without an Infallible Judge) might hit the right sense of Scripture: We Answer, First, you see here how your opinion doth miserably betray you to hard thoughts of Scripture, and consequently of God in it. Is not Scripture able to make us wise unto Salvation? Is it not given by inspiration? Is it not profitable for Doctrine, for Conviction, for Correction, for Instruction in Righteousnesse, that the man of God might be absolute, being made perfect unto every good work? as Saint *Paul* to *Timothy*, 2 *Tim.* 3. 15, 16. what can we desire more of Scripture in regard of sufficiency to its end, then that it should be *able to make us wise unto Salvation*? what can we want in it, as in regard of the matter of it towards that end, when as it is profitable as to those purposes? and if there be not all so clear, as that every one of the people may discerne the minde of God as towards a particular sense; yet the Man of God, the Minister of the Gospel by the Study and Learning he hath, may be able to be thereby furnished to every good work, that he may instruct others. Now I think you will not think that Saint *Paul* by the Man of God here intended the Pope, or any one Infallible

fallible Judge, and therefore your pretence of an Infallible Judge is unreasonable. Any Minister of the Gospel, by his abilities, is able competently, through the Scripture, to direct the people unto their happinesse; and the Scripture was inspired to this purpose, as it appears. And what need then of an Infallible Judge? It is true, every Minister is not able to explicate all difficulties of Scripture, no nor all your Popes and Councels neither, but in things necessary their knowledge may be sufficient; in points of debate, there is no necessity of certain knowledge, as unto Salvation. And this you afterward come to, when you take care to save the credit of the Church by a distinction, that it cannot teach any damnative error, so then it may erre, but not teach damnative error. The Scripture teacheth all things necessary, cannot erre at all; why then do we not rest here? Therefore take you no more the way of reckoning, we have an Infallible Judge therefore we must absolutely hear him. But first prove the necessity of a Judge indefinitely, and then who it is demonstratively, and then we have done. In the mean time, you are in the peril of Treason, not against Gods Judge, but against God the Judge, inserting up another Judge, in the Consciences of men. And if the subordinate Judge, who is not Infallible, goes without a Commission and makes Lawes himselfe, is not this Treason? So then, the subordinate Judge determines by Scripture or not; if not, then he makes a new Law: if he doth determine by Scripture, then doth his determination bind by Authority of Scripture, whereof he is but a Minister. And is not the Word by the Spirit of God Judicative? What else is said, *Heb.* 4. 12. Consider well that Text, and see if it may not answer all your objections against Scripture? If you say the Word of God is a Dead Letter, it cannot speak; it is here denyed to be a Living one: if you say that it cannot act; it is denyed, it is active, simple: if you say that cannot decide Controversies; what is said here of a sharper

per

*per then any two edged Sword.* It decides all Controversies of Faith, and those points of Faith (pretended) which are not, here it doth cut off. If you say that cannot reach the Conscience, what then can? it is piercing, even to the dividing of Soul and Spirit, Joynts and Marrow. If you say it cannot judge, it is here *Κριτικὸς*, Critical, exactly Judicative of the thoughts and notions of the heart; and this is more then any Judge on Earth can do. All that Judges on Earth can do, in our question, is but to declare and apply the decisions of Scripture against Error or Evil practice: if they go higher, they go above their Sphere. And since they may (for ought appears by you to the contrary) misse of the right determination, we use them but as Consuls, not as dictators: We consult them, and then look to the Rule. What then it is to submit your interiour Judgement (as you speak) to any one on Earth, I leave it to you to judge; since he, whosoever he is, can oblige assent no otherwise now then by light of Scripture, which is the standing and onely rule we have to go by unto happiness. And if we go any other way to settle our assent of truth (which is to be preferred before unity) we shall come no way to faith. So you see what is the cause of the chasm betwixt us; you cannot come to us, because you are bound and captivated by your Infallibility, which while you hold, it holds you in incapacity of being better advised; and we cannot come to you, because you hold it. It is hard to say which hath destroyed more Souls, uncertainty of that Religion which we have in Scripture, or Infallibility besides it; and yet not so hard; for Uncertainty may be helped, but Infallibility hath no remedy.

And now, forasmuch as you have not upon firm ground established the necessariness of an Infallible Judge, I need go no further, till this be made sure. I need not have any thing to do with your assumption, indeed, (if I may be so free) a presumption. Yet, lest you should take it amisse or ill, if I should say nothing to it by it selfe,

I

I shall not let it passe without some notice of it.

But what you say at first here, that if we finde out this Judge, we can never remain in any doubt; for without all doubt, we must stand to the judgement of this Judge, what reasons soever our private judgement or discretion may suggest: So you; this spoyles all; and this is an argument against you: that which you say is little else then *Contradictio in adjecto*, as they speak. If we must submit our judgements to an Infallible Judge (pretended) whatsoever reasons (of Scripture I mean) we have to the contrary, then there is no such Judge; for it is impossible for us in our judgements to assent to that, for which we see reasons of Scripture to the contrary. Take Reason simply, and so in matters of Faith it must *quiescere* (as the School phrase is) as a principle, because the doctrine of Faith is supernatural, in the judgement of *Aquinas*, at the beginning of his Summs; but take Reason as an Instrument for the finding out of the sense of Scripture; and so, what moments we finde in Scripture for any opinion, we cannot sink in any determinations on Earth. As far as the understanding sees appearance of Truth, it doth necessarily leap and run to it, and will not leave it for any Autority under Heaven: and therefore, while the reason of Authority is not so clearly drawn from the Word of God, as the reason of his Opinion in his own judgement, it cannot give up its assent. And if we are by duty to go your way of absolute credence to the dictates of your Judge, we must then, if he saies Vices are Vertues, say so too, as your Cardinal *Bellarmin* determins, in his 4. Book, *de Rom. Pontif. cap.* 5. And thus you again see whither your blind obedience will lead you, even from darknesse to darknesse.

In the seventh Number you lay to our charge an agreement with all Hereticks that have risen up against the Church, because we (as all Protestants) do hold that the Scripture is the onely Judge, by which all doubts

and differences and Controversies of Religion, are to be determined with Infallible Authority. To this Saint *Austin* answers, *l. de Trinit. cap.* 36.

We also answer to this charge, first, as before, that Hereticks have urged Authority too, and therefore by your argument, you must quit your way of the Authority of the Church, or else grant us our way of Scripture notwithstanding. Secondly, doth it follow rationally, that because the Hereticks have misapplyed Scripture, therefore we should not rightly apply it? If the Standard be made use of to ill purpose, of measuring cloth commodities, therefore shall not other measures be ruled hereby? It is accidental to Scripture to be thus abused: shall it therefore loose its proper priviledge? because, as Saint *Peter* saith, some who are unlearned and unsetled wrest Scriptures to their destruction; therefore those who are learned and setled may not improve it to their Salvation: because Robbers make use of the light of the Sun, for actions unrighteous and wicked; therefore honest men may not use the Light for their lawful imployments. Is this good reasoning? You had surely raised your discourse to the height, if you had told us that we must not urge Scripture, because the Devil did urge it unto our Saviour Christ. So one indeed concludes: as if the Devil did not apprehend what kinde of argument our Saviour would own, and what reject, therefore did he not set upon him with Tradition of the Church, as is noted. Neither did Christ reply upon him with Tradition, but with Scripture, which is a better Argument, that this is to be our Rule which we should be be ordered by. Thirdly, The Hereticks did not presse that which was true Scripture, but either corrupted it, as *Tertullian* observes in his præscriptions; or took onely so much as was for their use, or perverted the sense of it; so that if Scripture doth consist in the sense, they did not bring Scripture for their proof, but that which is not Scripture. Fourthly, Why doth *Bellarmine* and others of your

your Writers so frequently endeavour to uphold their Doctrines by Scripture, if because the Heretiaks use it, we must not? Neither do they plead Scripture by the Traditional sense of the Church, but by their own interpretations. When Scripture seems to them to speak for them, then they produce Scripture; but when they are oppressed with clear testimonies against them, then little respect is given thereunto. Fifthly, If Controversies are not to be ended by Scripture, which the Hereticks plead, then how are they to be ended by the judgement of the Church? Yes, you will say, but how shall Hereticks know, if they doubt what or which is the true Church? it must be by the Scripture, so that our last recourse must be to Scripture. Again, if Hereticks must be perswaded by the Church, then are they led, if not by their private judgements, yet by private judgements of others. For besides that the Church consists of private Men, the consent of the whole, if they could be certain of it, being compared to Scripture, in way of contradistinction, hath it self by manner of private judgement: All the publick power it hath, it hath by God and Scripture: then here again we must end. Again, how shall Hereticks know that all Controversies are to be ended by the Church? they must know it either by their own judgements of discretion, which you deny to us, or by the Church. What in its own cause? or by Scripture? so we must resolve our selves in Scripture, analytically we must bottome there, synthetically we must begin there. Sixthly, This practice of Hereticks, if it hath reason to make us forsake Scripture, hath it not reason also to make you retract your expressions of your self as towards Scripture, that you do professe all reverence and all credit to be due to Scripture, as the Infallible word of God, insomuch that you are ready to give your lives in defence of any thing contained herein? Will you stand to your words? If you will, then must you believe, that whatsoever is necessary is declared therein

sufficiently. For what saith the Scripture by Saint *Paul*, Gal. 1. 8. *If I, or an Angel from Heaven preach to you any other Doctrine besides what you have received, let him be Anathema.* And what then becomes of your unwritten word, on behalf whereof you wisely cry up the infallibility of the Church, in points of Religion? For as for the distinction of your then hereupon, that the Text is to be understood of that which is against it, not of that which is beside it, is invalid, for it is in the Text beside, *παρ'*, and besides, that which is beside it as a Rule, is against it: For if any thing be a Rule besides it, then is that now a Rule. For a Rule or Canon, as it excludes defect, so doth it exclude excess, and therefore, in necessaries to faith and salvation nothing is to be added; as in the 22. of the *Apocalypse* the 18. *If any man shall adde hereunto, God shall adde unto him the Plagues that are written in this Book*; After the consignation of the Canon, nothing is to be added as he said.

And your glorious asserting (which follows in your Treatise) that you onely do truly believe the Scripture, because you onely believe it to be the Word of God upon Divine Revelation manifested by Gods Church, which (as you will shew) is infallible, is certainly not very sound. Because first, this is not yet put out of question that the Church is infallible. This you would beg and have to be granted unto you: therefore you passe the proof of it here, and skip from this to the denial of true faith to the Protestants. For this Demonstration we must wait your leisure. Secondly, we deny unto you any reason of this your glory in the belief of Scripture, upon this consideration; that the Faith of Protestants is more grounded then yours is: for whatsoever authority the Church hath towards this perswasion we also make use of as a motive to this Faith: and then we do resolve and settle and determine our Faith hereof by the *αὐτοπίστια* of the word of God, which you say is the infallible Word of God. If it be infallible, it cannot deceive us. Neither can be it be said that we

cannot be assured of his infallibility by its self; because we cannot be assured of the Authority of the Church, but by the Word of God. Yea, this is the *ratio formalis* of Divine Faith, to believe what he saith to be true, because he saith it. Therefore must we believe that the Scripture is the Word of God, because he saith it. And suppose the Church were Infallible, yet must we ground and terminate our Faith hereof in Scripture, unlesse it did otherwise appear Infallibly to be so, or else we are in everlasting motion to and fro: as, Why do I believe the Scripture to be the VVord of God? because the Church saith it. VVhy do I believe the Church? because the Scripture beareth witnesse of it. How do I know the Scripture saith it? because, again the Church saith so. You must then come to us and our principles, if you will have any grounded constitution of Divine Faith: we fluctuate, and hover up and down like the Dove, untill we come to set a sure foot on the ground of Scripture. The prime and indemonstrable principle of all Divinity, amongst principles complexe, must be this, that the Scripture is the VVord of God.

And hereupon, that which you say in your eighth page, That it is no where written in Scripture, that such and such Books of Scripture be Canonical, and the undoubted VVord of God, &c. makes no prejudice against us (and yet that which is quoted in Scripture from any other book, under such a name, is upon this consideration Canonical) for they are worthy to be believed for themselves. As we assent unto prime principles, in the habit of intelligence, by their own light: so do we assent unto Scripture, to be the VVord of God; through the help of the Spirit of God, do we see the Scripture to be the VVord of God, as by its own light. Therefore hath Faith more proportion to Intelligence, then to Science, since we see no reason to believe, but by the credibility of the object which hath upon it impressed the Authority of God. And this

in effect, even *Aristotle* did see in his Rhetoricks, when he speaks of that which is πίστις ἄτεχνος, which is either by Humane Testimony or by Divine; in the latter whereof, that which makes the Faith, is the Testimony of God. And that testimony of Saint *Austin*, which your *Bellarmin* produceth against those who were for private Revelations, beside Scripture, in his first Book, *De verbo Dei, cap.* 2. (and he takes it out of the 12 of his *De Civit. cap.* 9.) infers as much in these words, *Scripturæ fides mirabilem auctoritatem non immeritò habet*, &c. The Faith of the Scripture, hath not undeservedly an admirable Authority in the Christian World, and in all Nations, which, amongst other things that it spoke, it did by a true Divinity foretell would believe it. It hath an admirable Authority, not undeservedly; mark that, not from the Christian world, but in the Christian world, and in all Nations which it did foretell would believe it; not the Church, for they that were the Church were to believe it first: it did foretell by a true Divinity: if then we would use a scientifical argument, and intrinsecal from the Scripture, it, should be this, that what it hath foretold, is come certainly to passe; and what is come to passe, in the belief of it it did foretell. The humane Faith then, such as that whereby we believe *Cicero*'s or *Virgils* books, is indeed yours; for you are they who have no other then humane grounds, and consequently an humane Faith, if your Faith doth rest upon the authority of Man. What you have more to say to this, out of the virtue of General Councils, you refer me to in the 19 Number; but all the light they give comes from the Sanctuary of Scripture, and therefore what Light you have, must be more then Mans.

In the middle of your eighth page, you say you have a second convincing Argument: it is easily denyed to be a second convincing Argument, for it cannot be a second convincing Argument, untill the first proves so.

But the summe of this Argument is drawn from our uncertainty

certainty of the knowledge of the Scripture to be the VVord of God by our translations, since the Scriptures were written in Ebrew and Greek, which one of ten thousand doth not perfectly understand. But do you not consider that this Argument will rebound with more force against you, for you have nothing at all for your belief, but the Authority of the Church in your Translation Latin. Yea, the people must have no knowledge at all by any Translation which they understand, therefore their Faith upon this account is lesse Divine, because they have no understanding of Scripture by any Interpretation. Secondly, The Translations are the VVord of God not absolutely, but so far as they agree with the Originals, and therefore by them we do not ground our Faith as such: but we ground our Faith upon that which is translated to be the VVord of God, because God by his Spirit perswadeth us of it, therefore the Fallibility of Translation doth not destroy our Faith, for we do not build it upon a Translation; but this you do, you rely upon your Latin Translation, which by the *Trent* Councel was Christened Authentique before it was born. You make that to be the Scripture, by which you must decide Controversies; (then you decide Controversies by Scripture.) And hath that no faults in it? Is it every word Infallibly done? If Infallibly done at first, why did *Clement* the eighth vary from *Sixtus quintus*? and why doth *Isidor Clarius* vary from him in thousands of places? And do you any where find in Scripture, that this Interpretation is made Canonical? And are there none that find great fault with this Latin one? If you will look into your *Bellarmine* in his third Book, *De verbo Dei*, 10. Chapter you may finde the contrary; and although it goes under the account of an antient Edition and *Hieronis*, yet in the Chapter before, you may see he findes adversary objections, and you may find by his confession that all is not his. VVhat need then *Sixtus Quintus* have made it up? And is not your

Session the 4. as *Bel.* in the 30. B. *De verbo Dei*, c. 9.

Rhemish

Rhemish Testament very faultie? Will you undertake to make it all good against *Fulk*? And if you say that you may be certain of your Latin by the Church which you will prove to be infallible; until you do prove it, you doe again commit the fallacie [illegible]. This should have been made irrefragably sure at first by *Achillean* invincible arguments, and then we should have fallen down before you. But again you tell us you will do it, and presently fly at us for our Opinion. Is there not one of yours who is prettily, in his Opposition against Bishop *Andrews* about the Popes temporal power, compared to the *pulex*,

*Qui cessim fugit & fugit recessim,*
*Et subsultibus hinc & hinc citatis*
*Vibrat cruscula;*

And is there no more do so?

In some lines following of your Treatise we have nothing but petitions or repetitions, and we answer no more till you prove more, then this, no man ever erred by following Scripture sincerely which you grant to be the infallible Word of God: If they erred, they erred from Scripture, not by it. But fools may be made wise by Scripture, and wise men may erre by your Church, until you make it infallible. *Nullibi pronior fidei lapsus quam ubi rei falsæ gravis autor exstitit*, as he said. If they may teach that which is false, wise men may also be deceived; if they be not infallible, they may teach that which is false.

But in the eighth line of the ninth page you oppose to me Saint *Austins* authoritie, and of all the greatest Doctors which ever the Church had, that they professed themselves unable to understand the Scriptures, and that after many years study, and how then, &c.

We easily answer, Saint *Austin* doth not say that the Scripture is absolutely and universally, in all places so difficult, that we may not get out from thence that which will

direct

direct us to Heaven, for then he should contradict himself. Doth he not say in his 4th. chapter of the 2. Book *De Doct. Christ.* That there are some things indeed difficult; but the obscurity is profitable to tame our pride by labour, and to bring back our understanding from loathing, *cui facile investigata plerumque vile fiscum*, as he saith. And fully again in in his 10th. Tome, *De verbis Apostoli*, Serm. the 13th. *Verbi Dei altitudo*, &c. The sublimitie of the Word of God doth exercise our study, doth not deny to be understood. If all were shut up, there would be nothing whereby that which is obscure would be revealed. Again, if all were covered, there would not be from whence the soul should receive nourishment, and might have strength to knock at that which is shut. Therefore your fallacie is *à dicto secundum quid*, if from hence, you would conclude all to be difficult: yea so, you would contradict Saint *Peter*, who saith of Saint *Paul's* Epistles, *that somethings of them are hard to be understood*, not all; *Exceptis in non exceptis firmat regulam*, as the Rule is. Yea, you would contradict your self, who say more then once, that those things which are plain in Scripture, you believe by the authority of Scripture. But if from the asserting of some things difficult, you would onely conclude that this cannot be the judge in Controversies, as you seem to intend in your conclusion; we say plainly, this difficulty in some things of Scripture doth not inferre the necessity of an infallible Judge on earth, your premisses do not conclude this, and we allow unto you the use of Judges on earth, although they be not infallible. As Judges in civil Causes may and do sometimes erre, yet is there use of them; so also is there of Ecclesiastical Judges, though not incapable of errour: and again, there is no peril of damnation on either side soberly held in points of Question; and therefore the Scripture yet may be the way so direct that fools cannot erre in matters of necessary faith and practice. And fourthly, a General Council is the highest you can goe in humane

Authoritie, and yet this doth not binde unto Faith, because it is not free from errour. To which purpose believe Saint *Austin*, if you will stand to his judgement, in his third book against *Maximinus* Bish. of the *Arrians*, the fourteenth chapter, *Sed nunc nec ego Nicænum*, &c. But now neither ought I produce the *Nicene* Council, nor you that of *Ariminum*, as boasting thereof: neither am I held under the authority of this, nor you of the other. Let matter with matter, cause with cause, reason with reason, be debated by Authorities of Scriptures, not proper witnesses to any, but common to both. So he. Where you see he prefers the authorities of Scripture before Councils, which are proved not infallible even here, because one was for the *Arrians*. Here is Council against Council, as there hath been Pope against Pope. In this case what will you do? which must you submit to? Is one infallible contrary to another infallible? If you must submit to both, you submit to errour, if to one, why not to the other if that be infallible. And this also will include uncertainty of all humane definitions about the Canon of Scripture, which hath been spoken to before.

We come now to your second Reason in your eighth Number.

That you say comes into this Enthymeme. Many Controversies there are, and may be yet very many more most neerly concerning the necessary means to salvation which can never be ended, and undoubtedly decided by judgement and sentence of the Scriptures; therefore the Scripture is not the Judge.

We answer to the Antecedent, in those termes I deny it in both the branches, if you mean, by those things nearly concerning the necessary means to salvation, such things as are indeed necessary to salvation; otherwise you go upon a false supposition that there is a necessitie of a Judge on earth, undoubtedly to decide that which is not necessarie. Therefore chuse you which you will hold to; if you mean those

those following instances to be of the necessaries, I deny the antecedent in both branches, if not, I deny your supposition. Taking you in the former sence, I say that there are not now many Controversies necessary to be determined unto salvation, which may not undoubtedly be decided by Scripture: and also I say there may not be yet many more. The first branch I deny, because though many things which are *res quæstionis*, are not decided by Scripture, yet many controversies in things necessary cannot be said not to be undoubtedly decided by Scripture, because in things necessary there are not many Controversies. And the second branch I denie, because we cannot expect any new necessaries, and a new Tradition is a certain contradiction.

Now to answer to your particulars for the proof of the antegedent. Controversie may be moved (you say) concerning the lawfulnes of working and not working of Saturdayes and Sundayes. How will this Controversie be decided by the Scripture, *&c.* So you.

To which we return you this answer, that there is enough in Scripture to ground the practice of the Church for the observing of the Lords day. First by the proportion to the Equity of keeping one day in seven, which wee have in the fourth Commandement. There is in the Commandment *morale naturæ*, that there should be a time set a part for publicke worship; and this by the Light of Nature the Heathens did see; as *Tully*, *Non ut Consilii sic Sacrificii, &c.* There is not a day appointed of Counsel, as of sacrifice; then there is a positive determination to the Jew of the seventh day, to be the day in the week of their solemn service; and to this is agreable by good analogie, that Christians should keep one day in seven as well as the Jews. Now the moments in Scripture for the Translation of the day are several, the appellation of the Lords day, most likely of the day we keep, the meeting of the Disciples and breaking of

breadon the first day of the week; the order for the provision for the poor by Saint *Paul* to the *Corinthians*. To these we add the *Syriack* Interpretation, which in the first Epistle to the *Corinthians* the 11. Chapter and the 20. Verse, expresseth it thus; when therefore you meet, you do not, as it is just on the Lords Day, eating and drinking, which is to be understood of the Communion, according to the scope of the place. And therefore may we think that this point of practise was so competently set out in Scripture, as that we cannot suspend the usage upon the Authoritie of the Church, since we may conceive that the Church was bound by the former Considerations to celebrate the Day of Christs Resurrection, which is the Hope of the new Creature. The seventh Day to the Jew was Positive and Ceremonial; and therefore upon that account, under capacity of being altered: and the Equity of one day in the week is now under practice upon the former intimations. Secondly, If the Jewish day ceaseth not in the Obligation to Christians, then the time when Christians should keep, is under the Divine Commandement, and is none of those things wherein the Church hath power; because, as you will confesse, it hath no authority to rescinde a Divine precept. So then, if by necessity of mean it is necessary to keep the Lords day, it is lawfully done and upon duty; if it be not necessary by necessity of mean, then is this Example of yours impertinent. And so this argument (unanswerable, as you esteem it) is without much labour answered by those who make the Scripture, in which God speaks, by him the sole Infallible Judge; not excluding subordinate Judges; which are to regulate their decisions by the rule of the word, unto which the Scripture is not silent: and in other things no need to be sure of such a Judge as you would have.

And this second Answer to your first instance, may be available for your satisfaction in your second instance from the

the 15. of the Acts. For if those precepts of the Apostles in that Council, do binde all alwaies, then is the matter determined by Scripture: if they do not, then are we at our Christian liberty from them, without a formal discharge thereof from the Church. And secondly, that we are not held under obedience to those Lawes, appeares by the intention of their imposition for that time: since they were imposed upon occasion of scandal to the weak Jew, the reason whereof now ceaseth, and therefore the Laws, *ubi ratio cessat lex cessat*, as the rule is. Onely as the Ceremonial Lawes binde, yet *quoad genus* as they shall, that there should be a decent publick worship in the Church of God, not *quoad speciem*, that we should continue the use of the same Ceremonies: so even these precepts which were in their nature Ceremonial, do yet binde so far in proportion of kinde, that in things of indifferency we should have respect to our weake Brother. Thirdly, Neither can you say, that either he that does abstain from these things forbidden, or he that does not abstain, is upon that account in danger of damnation. And therefore as *quoad hoc*, we distinguish of your term Necessary; if you take this matter Necessary as absolutely so by the morality of it, or perpetual by appointment, then we deny it to be necessary so, and why do not you keep them? if onely necessary as to present practice, then doth it not come up to our question: for it is none of those things necessary to Salvation, which are determinable by the Church, and not by Scripture.

In your tenth Number you give us another case not umpired by Scripture, whether the King is Head of the Church. And this, you say, we thought once to be determined by Scripture affirmatively: now not; so you in effect: this point is now no longer ascertained us by infallible judgement of Scripture, so you in terms. We answer. First, What is infallibly decided in Scripture, will ever be so, although we do not alwaies finde it; but

we

wherein we find any thing infallibly decided by the Church. Secondly, We do not say that every point is Infallibly decided in Scripture, because it is not at all decided therefore if you meant us so, you mistake us. And now, premising these considerations, we answer, that we do hold our principle still, if you will understand us according to our mind. Head of the Church as you hold the Pope to be Head of the Church, so as that we are bound in Conscience, as upon his Infallibility, to be ruled by his dictates, in matters of Religion, we never held the King to be, but to be Head of the Church, so as to be the chief Governor thereof, as being appointed by God to be the Keeper of both Tables, so we hold him to be still. This distinction makes an end, as it may seem, of your objection; and yet secondly, we do not pretend the King to be head of the Universal Church, as you pretend the Pope to be head of the Universal Church: and therefore are they not compared *ad idem*. Thirdly, Is it determined in Scripture, whether the Pope be Head of the Church or not. You say it is, for if you say it is not, you are all lost. Well, if it be determined by Scripture, then consequently it is determined in Scripture that the King is not: and so this your Controversie is one of those, which is decided and concluded negatively, in or by Scripture. So this exception against us doth not thrive.

Another point of this kind you make, in your eleventh Number, about the Canon of Scripture, your Argument seems to be thus, that we should know the Canon is necessary: we do not know it by Scripture, therefore by the Church. Is it not thus? you cannot make your matter shorter without any detriment to you. And therefore we answer, first, as an first (which you give us the occasion to put you in mind of) that if the Church were Infallible Judge of all Canonical books, yet would it not follow from hence, that it should be Infallible Judge in all points of Faith, and Manners (which you would fain have, as ve-

ry

ry useful for you) unless confess, for we might require more assistance to the Church in this particular, then in other cases: since also, when that is made sure, that there are the books of Scripture, we should look for no other direction for Life and Salvation but this. Therefore, if you argue, that because it is a Judge infallible of Canonical books, it is Judge of all things, you do not rightly proceed from a particular to an Universal, and therefore you do not conclude in your first Universality. Secondly, We are not to be assured by Divine Faith, that these are Canonical books, from the authority of the Church, and therefore is not the Church the infallible Judge here. We must believe them to be Canonical by their own Authority, otherwise we shall never believe them to be so: to that you see, we deny the Assumption, and we say we may know the Canonical books by Scripture, we have no other Divine Authority to know them by. They bear witness of themselves, they carry their own light, which we may see them by, as we see the Sun by its own light. Further me put you to this Dilemma, either the Scripture is to be believed for it self, or the Church is to be believed for it self. If the Scripture be to be believed for it self, then have we our cause; if the Church be to be believed for it self, then must we know this by a Revelation beside Scripture, which your Bellarmine disputes against in the beginning of his Controversies; and whether that Revelation be not Anabaptistical, and more uncertain then the word of God, judge you. And I pray is it not more fit, that the Scripture should be believed in its own cause, then the Church? but if you say that the Authority of the Church is evidenced by Scripture concerning it, then that is to be believed for it self as towards the Church, and why not then other parts of it? Thirdly, If the Church be the Judge infallible of Canonical books, how came Saint Hierome to be repugnant to the Church in the debate about Books Apocryphal?

Apocryphal, as you know and may see by Pope *Bellarmine* in his second Book, *De verbo Dei*, cap. 9. amongst which Apocryphal books the *Maccabees* are numbred to be by him accounted such; and therefore Saint *Jerome* did not in his Latin Edition translate them: and then let S. *Jerom's* authority justifie *Luther* upon your principles: for you account the *Maccabees* to be as well Canonical, as you and we do the *Apocalyps*. That the Scripture is silent of its own Canon, and that we cannot prove a book to be infallibly Canonical by it self without begging the question, hath little of judicious satisfaction for how do we see light? how do we prove first and indemonstrable principles? how do we prove that which we apprehend by natural light? after this manner is the understanding irradiated to see the authority of Scripture in it and by it, well, and how do we prove the Church to be infallible by it, without begging the question? therefore you must come about to Scripture. And again, if you prove the Church to be infallible Judge herein, because the Scripture is not, you beg the question who are to dispute; not I, who am to answer.

Your twelfth number goes upon a false supposition, at least in part of it, namely, that we are bound to believe that the Gospel of Saint *Matthew* was written by him, as also the Gospel of St. *Mark* to be written by St. *Mark*. We deny it. We are bound indeed to believe that the Gospel of St. *Matthew*, and St. *Mark*, as we distinguish them, are the word of God, but we are not bound to believe that they were written by them. It is no part or duty of my faith to believe the Penman of any part of Scripture, save onely so far as it is declared in the body of Scripture, for it is not Scripture because Saint *Matthew* wrote it, but Saint *Matthew* wrote it, as being inspired that it was the word of God, in the matter of it: If then your discourse goes upon the matter of it, it was answered before; if upon the title, it is not allowed to be *de fide* or any point of faith, that such was writer of any piece of

Scripture.

Scripture. And whereas you urge that some have denied this Gospel, and some or other have denied other books to be Canonical, how then shall we end this Controversie or others about the Canon by Scripture? I answer. And do not Hereticks deny your Church to be infallible? will you therefore quit your opinion? So then either this argument is not good against us, or it is also good against you. Secondly, If Hereticks reject some books, we may be disposed by the authority of the Catholick Church to our faith of them by their own authority. And this seems to be as much as Saint *Austin* would have us to attribute to the Church in this particular, as we have his advice in his second Book *de Doctrinâ Christianâ cap.* 8. where he says, *in Canonicis autem Scripturis Ecclesiarum Catholicarum quam plurimum sequatur authoritatem*; In Canonical Scriptures let him very much follow the authority of the Catholick Churches; amongst which surely these are they which merited (if you will construe it so) to have Apostolick seats, and to receive (Apostolick) Epistles. Observe that he saith, let him follow the authoritie very much, which doth not conclude that we should wholly rely upon it, and of the Catholick Churches in the plural; not one only. Then there are more Catholick Churches in his judgement, and such are they which merited to have Apostolick Seas, and Epistles; then your Church onely is not to be called the Apostolique Sea. And whereas afterward in this Church he doth reckon *Apocryphall* Books; yet is it to be noted, that herein he followed the authoritie of the Churches; Notwithstanding which, Saint *Jerome*, as before, did not receive them; which makes a sufficient reason to hold that the authority of the Churches is not a sufficient ground of faith in the belief of Canonical Books, or else St. *Jerome* (who in this may be compared with St. *Austin* for his judgement) is in the same condemnation with us.

Afterwards you plead, that since the Gospel of S. *Matthew* was written in Hebrew, whereof there is not extant

any one Copy in the world, and is not certain who or how faithfully he did translate it; we cannot be certain by the Scripture that this is the word of God; therefore by the Church. This I think is the sum of your plea. We answer.

First, Again we do not disclaim the use of the Catholique Churches in the credence of the Word of God: but this doth not certifie us. Secondly, You Catholiques (as you would be called) speak largely, that not one of the Ancients conceived it to be written in Greek; surely all the Ancients did not write: surely all that did write are not now had. But take it of all that did write and are now extant, and put it to be so that all were of Saint *Ferome's* Opinion in his Preface upon Saint *Matthew*, yet all that you say is not certainly true, that there is not a Copy of the Hebrew Gospel extant in all the world. For, if not to speak of the Hebrew Gospels set out by *Munster* and *Mercer*, which *Ludovicus de Dieu* takes notice of in the Preface to his Notes upon the Gospels) if you will give any heed to your *Isidor Clarius*, he will tell you I suppose otherwise; when he saith (in a little Preface which is a Testimonie out of Saint *Ferome* in his Catalogue of Ecclesiastick writers) that St. *Ferome* there affirms, *ipsum Hebraicum habetur usq; hodie in Cæsariensi Bibliotheca*, which *Pamphilus* the Martyr, *studiosissimè confecit*, and that he had the liberty by the *Nazareans*, who in *Berœa* a City of *Syria*, do use this volume, to describe it. So he. Now it may be that remains there, and therefore you cannot be certain of what you say. And this is more then an ordinary Authority of the Church in an interpretation.

Again how come your Latin interpretation of this Gospel to be authentique if it was not taken out of an authentick copie; for the Church can doe no more then declare that which is authentique, then must it be authentique, otherwise they make Scripture.

Again

Again let me give you one intimation, that possibly it might yet at first be written in Greek, my reason is this, in the first of Saint *Matthew*, 23. verse, it is said of Christ, *they shall call his name Emmanuel*, which being interpreted is, *God with us*. If it were written in Ebrew, what need of any interpretation in the same Language, since the Letters of the Word put together, without any variation, do make that signification?

Again, if the Church hath made the Greek Translation authentique, why is your Latin made authentique? Is there two authentiques? If it be not authentique by the Church, what would you infer?

Again, the harmony of it with other Gospels, hath more in it to perswade Faith, then the credit of the Church.

Again, if it be an Interpretation, yet unlesse you do evince it, that we do build our Faith upon the Interpretation, you do nothing. Now then as your people do fix their Faith upon that which is interpreted, not upon the interpretation: so may we build our belief upon this Gospel to be the Word of God by the illumination of the Spirit of God, and yet not upon the Translation. The Translation doth but convaigh into our knowledge the words, but it is the Spirit of God that doth work in us belief thereof that it is the VVord of God. The Translation attends the Notification of the object, what that is which is to be believed: but it is the Divine perswasion which attends the act, and is the cause why it is believed: the Interpretation is but the Instrument of Faith, the ground of it is the perswasion of God, that it is the Truth and VVord of God: and therefore your argumentation goes upon a wrong supposition, as if we resolved our Faith in the Translation as such.

And what you except afterwards against the certainty of our Faith, upon the account of the Greek Translation, doth also return easily upon you; for the same possibility

of error, is urged against your Latin, either by ignorance, or negligence, or on purpose for the upholding of your new opinions. And let me ask you, why you account your Latin so be Authentique? you will say, because the Church of *Rome* was infallibly assisted in it. VVas it then infallibly assisted, when it renders the Ebrew in *Genesis ipsa* for *ipsum*, that it might be for the honour of the Virgin? VVell, but give it that the Latin was infallibly made by the Church, why not the Greek also infallibly made by the Church? and more confirmed by the Church then your Latin one? you get nothing then by this exception. And this may satisfie you, how an *Ecclesiam* might believe the Gospel of Saint *Matthew*, which you put to the question. An opinion thereof he may have by the judgement of the Church, some knowledge of it to be the Word of God he may gather by the agreement with the other Gospels: but the Faith of it to be such, is to be wrought by the Spirit of God, whereby those who heard the Apostles, were caused to believe that which they preached to be the Word of God without perswasion of the Church, which was not then in a body, when some first believed.

As for the Fathers holding Books to be Canonical by the Church, we have spoken to already in this paper, and we shall meet with it again. You speak indeed of them as in general, upon designe, *ad faciendum populum*; but you do not name the places, onely Saint *Athanasius*, you are pleased to quote. VVe answer, if you mean that he received the Gospels, and rejected the Gospel of St. *Thomas* upon the Authority of the Church, as the cause of his Faith of them, you do not prove it by what he saies: If you mean that he was induced to think well of them by the reception of the Church, and to refuse the other by their refusal, this doth not come home to the question. And suppose the Church its refusal of the Gospel of Saint *Thomas*, was sufficient for him to refuse it too, yet doth

it

it not follow, that because the Church did receive the other Gospels, he received them no otherwise, then because they did; for this makes the reception of the Church to be but as a necessary condition, not the formal cause of his Faith. As for *Tertullians* and Saint *Jeroms* and St. *Austins* authorities in this case, we shall finde an answer, when you quote the places.

The Testimony of *Eusebius*, which you produce as out of the third Book, chap. 19. is not there, according to that of *Robert Steven* in Greek, which came out *Lutetiæ Parisiorum cum Privilegio Regis.*

In the ninth Chapter indeed of the same Book, there is somewhat of *Josephus*, that he gives the number of the Books of the Old Testament, and which are uncontradicted by the Ebrews, in the same words by them teaching as out of antient Tradition. But here we have but *Josephus* his opinion. Secondly, This is but for the Old Testament, not the whole Scripture. Thirdly, This is but as out of Tradition. Fourthly, You will not find in the next chapter, all your Apocryphal books. The Number he makes to be 22. in which Number *Cyril* of *Jerusalem* (in his fourth *Cat.*) excludes all but *Baruch*. Fifthly, After so much time which is past, he saies, no man durst add or take away, or change any of them. And that which he speaks at the end of the chapter that he followed Tradition, and therefore did not erre; if you mean that, it is not pertinent, for he doth not there speak of Scripture. Your flourish then as hereupon, must yet vanish. And besides, all signes are not able to make a certainty, the Tradition of the Church is not an evident signe: it is not Τυπώσεως, for the Church received some things and held them too, which you will not hold, as Infant Communion, and the Millenary Opinion; therefore can we not be assured in way of Faith (wherein there is no falsity) by the Church.

That of Saint *Austin* will be included in the disquisition of the main Testimony of that Epistle.

And to your question which of the Fathers, when they were asked, did answer, that they did believe the Canonical Books upon our ground; that which was said in the former paper of Saint *Origen* and Saint *Athanasius*, remains good untill it be answered.

In your thirteenth Number you object *Luthers* not seeing the *Apocalyps*, and the Epistle of Saint *James*, to be Canonical by their own light. We answer,

First, A negative argument from one is easily denyed to be cogent, when we cannot yeild it to the Church; because he did not see them, therefore they could not be seen, is no argument. Secondly, You see then hereby that we do not follow him in all things blindely, as you do the Church in whatsoever it proposeth.

Secondly, The *Apocalyps* was doubted of by others also, as you know by Ecclesiastical history, although now it is universally received. So also might *Luther* afterwards come to the sight of them to be Canonical.

And Thirdly, also other books have been scrupled, notwithstanding the authority of the Church, and therefore how is that a ground of their Faith?

Saint *Austin* you make use of afterwards for the Canonicalnesse of the *Macchabees*, upon the credit of the Council of *Carthage*, and also the book of *Wisdome*. To this we need say no more then hath been said, save onely we may hence observe, how uncertain we are of a ground of Faith, in the authority of the Fathers, when one sayes that which is contrary to the other. Answer you Saint *Ferome* upon the point, as before. And Saint *Ferome*, I hope, yet was a Catholick, and was not damned because he did not embrace the opinion of the Church in this. If the Church be Infallible to Saint *Austin*, why not to Saint *Ferome*? or one may see that which is Infallible, and the other not, then is your former objection thereby taken away. And you will hold Saint *Austin* no otherwise to have held the *Macchabees* to be Canonical, then he held the book of

*Wisdome*

*Wisedome* to be Canonical, and you will hold that the Council of *Carthage* held the book of *Maccabees* to be Canonical, as Saint *Austin* held the book of *Wisedome* to be Canonical. This I suppose you will agree to without dispute. Well then, be pleased to take notice of what abatements and deductings may be found in Saint *Austin* upon the place, in regard of Equalitie of Respect which you think he gave to this book of *Wisedome* and to Canonical Scripture. First, it seems there was exception taken at the authority of that book, even in their Opinion of St. *Austins* judgement thereupon, and therefore he saith, *Quasi & excepta*, &c. As if, if this attestation were excepted, the thing it self were not clear, which we will have from hence to be taught, namely this; *he was taken away, that wickednesse might not alter his understanding*, which Saint *Cyprian*, he saith, had taken out of the book of *Wisedome*. And when he had discoursed the Truth of the sentence, he inferrs; which things being so, this sentence of the *Book of Wisedome* ought not to be rejected, which hath merited to be read of those who are of the degree of Readers of the Church by so long antiquitie; and then follow your words. Onely you may excuse me, if secondly I be a little critical; for it is not said there that it was received of all, but it was heard of all, with veneration of Divine Authoritie. If there be no difference, why doe ye not use the word? if you do falsifie, then it seems there is some difference, and outwardly they might give respect to it as Canonical, although whether in their apprehensions they did esteem it as such may be a question. But thirdly, you see it here to be somewhat distinguished from Books Canonical and to depend upon prescription; as if it were not so from the beginning. Fourthly, those who were Tractatom's next to the time of the Apostles did prefer this book before themselves, which using this as a witnesse did believe that they brought no other then a Divine Testimony. So the Father, whereby is intimated that this was as *deutero*

Cano-

Canonical (as it is expressed) and not of proper name, Canonical; and also herein is signified that it was not so used in the Apostles times. And again, this Book had merited to be read by so great a numerositie of years, and afterwards he calls this sentence anciently Christian. So upon the whole matter you see some difference made betwixt this book and others by themselves Canonical. Peruse then the whole chapter, and you will see how little advantage you can make thereof. Indeed there is in the chapter a word which I know not whether I have rendred according to your mind; it is *mereri*, and yet I think I have interpreted it discreetly by meriting, that so it might be capable of the same Latitude; but I put you to your choice: How the Fathers use the word you know for obtaining. But if you will have it here to be construed by plain deserving, then we have an Argument against you: For if the book deserved to be read in the Church, then was it not accounted as Divine and Canonical, because it was received by the Church; but it was received by the Church, because it did deserve it by the matter. If you will not understand it here of plain deserving, then here is one place, where the Father useth the words not in the *Roman* sence; which may be made use of to another pupose about your opinion of merit; and also, if you will not mean it here of deserving, this makes some diminution of respect to the book: and some advantage more I shall make of this chapter in its place.

*De Predestinatione Sanctorum, cap. 14.*

Many lines in your fourteenth page you have afterwards, wherein we have nothing but vaunts or repetitions: I will not trouble you with the latter, nor my self with the former: But towards the end of that page you would order the matter so as to hold your own, and yet to give Scripture its due respects. And you seem to bring it to this determination, that when there is an acknowledgement made that the Scriptures are in themselves the Word of God, it doth not derogate from Scripture to hold that

yet

yet they are not known to us by an infallible ground, that they are the Word of God, but by the testimony of the Church, which in shorter terms is expressed by others of your Church, that the authoritie of the Scripture doth depend upon the Church. But this will not serve, the covering is too short.

For first, this distinction is too narrow to extend to the difference betwixt us in particular points of faith. Therefore if you will yield that points of Religion are to be examined and ended infallibly by Scripture, when we know it to be the Word of God, then we will onely stick to this Question: But if you will still maintain the infallibilitie of the Church in all her definitions, then your composition will not be sufficient, although it could satisfie as to that particular. But secondly, It will not satisfie, because you do not sufficiently provide for the honour of the Scriptures authoritie, and therefore you derogate from Scripture in this, although you did take away no honour from Scripture as in regard of its truth.

Do you lay it to heart, that the many questions betwixt us is about the authoritie of the Scripture; the formal Reason of credibilitie is the authoritie. That which makes me to believe it to be the Truth of God, as being his Word, is the Authoritie. For if the credibilitie doth rise from the truth of it in it self, you destroy your own cause; for that you confesse the Scripture to be the infallible Word of God: then betwixt us simply about the Truth of the Scripture there is no contest. And doe not you affirm that the authoritie of the Church is the Ground of Faith, because you think that the Church by its authoritie is worthy to be believed since it is infallible? But why then do you not grant this authority to the Scripture, since you confess it to be infallible? If the reason of believing the Church be the infallibility of it, according to you; why is not the infallibility of the Scripture the reason of believing it, since it is confessed infallible? And if you say

you do believe it to be so by the authority of the Church, then the formal reason of believing it is not the infallibility of the Scripture, but of the Church; and yet the infallibility of the Church shall be the formal reason of believing it. But you say, you must know the Scripture to be infallible, that I cannot do but by the Church. Well, but do not you then see that you preferre the authority of the Church before the authority of Scripture: for the Church with you, is to be believed for it self: for so it must be; or else the Scripture must be believed for it self, or else we shall have in Divinity no *principium primo primum*, wherein to rest. Now if the Scripture be to be believed for it self, then we have ended the businesse. If the Church be to be believed for it self, then we prefer the Authority of the Church before the authority of Scripture, then you derogate from the authority of Scripture. Thirdly, the Church hath authority or not. It hath you say, then of it self or not, what will you say? If of it self, what hath a company of Christians more to say for themselves then others. If you say the authority comes from succession; others also have had a constant succession. And it must come to one first society: Well, where had that society its authority, of it self or not? If of it self, what by revelation beside Scripture or not? If beside, then the charge of *Anabaptisticalness* is fallen upon you. What then? From Scripture. Well then the Scripture in regard of those Texts which concern the Church is to be believed for it self, and then why not in others? Fourthly, The Word of God in the substance and matter of it was before the Church therefore, because the Church was begotten by it: and therefore it must be known before the Church. Yea, reconcile your Opinion with that of *Bellarmine* in his first Book *De Verbo Dei, cap.* 20. The Rule of Catholique Faith must be certain and known; for if it be not known, then it will not be a Rule to us: If it be not certain, it cannot be a Rule. If it be a known Rule against *Anabaptists*, why not also a known

known Rule against Papists; and therefore that it must be made manifest by the Church is not necessary, for how was it made manifest to the first Church to be the rule?

As for the instance of yours, that Christ was made manifest to many by the Testimony of the Baptist and of the Apostles before the Scriptures were written, and yet this derogate not from Scripture; We answer soon. First, It is yet to be proved whether the Church hath that inspiration as *John Baptist* and the Apostles had for the first planting of the Church; until that be made good, your Argumentation is not. Secondly, Although the New Testament was not written, the Old was, and *John* the *Baptist* and the Apostles preached no other Doctrine then was contained in the Old. So our Saviour, *If ye had believed* Moses, *ye would have believed me*, for he wrote of me in the 5. of Saint *John* the 46. verse. Thirdly, If *John* the *Baptist* and the Apostles were believed by a Divine Faith without the authority of the Church (as the first Disciples did) why may not the Scriptures be believed by a Divine Faith without the authority of the Church? If the Apostles were believed immediately without the Church in what they said: why may they not be believed also in what they wrote?

And surely, to goe a little more close and deep, if we speak properly, there is not so much a ground of Faith, as a cause; if with the Schoolmen we grant (as we may) that Faith is a supernatural habit, infused by God, which disposeth the understanding to assent that which is said by God is true, because he saith it, not because the Church saith it. And if you say that the Scripture and the Church are not opposite; true, when the Church ruleth it self by Scripture. But if the Question be, which proposal is first, that of the Scripture, or that of the Church; here the Church is opposite to Scripture if it pretend to be first, for both cannot be first. Therefore the first *Axiom* in Divinity, and consequently of Divine Faith, must be that the

Scripture is the Word of God: and then this Scripture is substracted as the ground of all particulars to be necessarily believed; and therefore if we should have no other Faith of Scripture, then by the credibility of the Church, for ought is yet proved we should have no Divine Faith.

In your 14. Number, you go about to prove that the Scripture is not the appointed Judge in all Controversies: For many things (you say) are so set down in Scripture, that almost all the Controversies which are in the Church, doe arise about the true interpretation of the Scripture. We Answer,

First, here we see that you would have more to be the question then that, Whether the Church be the judge of the Books Canonical, and that the Scripture is the VVord of God. Therefore we follow you, and do say, Secondly, That it seems then the Question is onely who should be the infallible Judge to discusse and decide the debates which do arise about the sense of Scripture. So then again, those things which are plainly set down in Scripture (as the many necessary things are) are allowed to be believed without the voice of the Church: and therefore all points of Faith you cannot, it seems, include within the compass of necessary submission to the Church therein. Thirdly, your discourse proceeds not effectually to your conclusion, unlesse you can prove that the uncertainty of the sense of some passages in Scripture doth convince the necessity of an infallible Judge herein. Secondly, That we are infallibly certain thereof. And Thirdly, That the Church of *Rome* is it. These particulars are yet depending, and without their affirmation we may affirm that God hath well enough provided for the salvation of men in the Scripture, which is more easie to be understood, then the universal consent of all the Fathers; whose Opinions also must be held true as they are agreeable to the Rule. And also hath he provided wisely for us, in that he hath not left us

to

to the *Lesbian* Rule of humane authority: and also hath provided for the peace of the Church, in that he hath given us direction of the Pastours; whom although we cannot absolutely believe, yet doe not impudently oppose.

Yet you will say, if Christ had intended this book for our sole Judge (infallible you mean, otherwise you doe not contradict me) in all controversies, he would undoubtedly in some part of this book have told us so clearly, this importing so exceedingly as it doth; and yet he hath not done so. We answer, Christ hath directly declared his will to oblige us unto Scripture, in that *he biddeth us to search the Scriptures*; in that he saith, *ye erre not knowing the Scriptures*, as before: In that he said by Saint *Paul* that *all Scripture is given by Inspiration and is profitable*, &c. and that *it is able to make the man of God wise unto salvation*, as before; And by Saint *Peter*, 2. Ep. 1. cap. 19. *we have a more sure word of Prophesie, to which you do well giving heed, as to a Light that shineth in a dark place untill the Day dawn, and the Day-star arise in your hearts*. And as for Pastours of the Church, again and again we say, we deny them not a lawful use, or to them a lawful respect in things of God: but they doe but carry the Lantern in the dark. So that by this Light of Scripture are we directed unto salvation. Secondly, We turn the mouth of your Argument against you, if Christ had intended that the Church should have been the infallible Judge, it importing so exceedingly, he would have told us so clearly, and infallibly, which he hath not done. He telleth us all Scripture is given by inspiration; and this Proposition if we rightly believe, we believe upon its own authority, because it was given by inspiration: but it is not as clearly said, that the Church judgeth by inspiration. And if it doth, why doth it not determine all Controversies in the Church; and therefore is it either wanting in ability, or peccant in duty. Or if there may be Controversies in your Church without defi-

definition of the Church, why may not there be Controversies amongst us, without actual decision of Scripture.

And now, Sirs, let me have leave to speak affectionately to you, do you not see what dis-respect of Scripture (if not Blasphemies) your Opinion doth miserably betray you to, if you follow it? Would any sober man let fall such words? as if God had intended the Scripture for our Judge, such a book as the Scripture is. So you. Why? which often times speaks so prophetically, that most would think he speaks of the time present, when he speaks of the time to come. So you.

First, how are these words put together, so Prophetically, that, &c. would it seem to be more Prophetical to speak under the formality of futurition? but if it be Prophetical, to speak of that which is to come, as in *verbis de præsenti*, then what can you blame in that part of Scripture which is Prophetical? Or do you think that it was not meet that in the Old Testament there should be somewhat Prophetical? Or will you think that God made that part of Scripture on purpose obscure, that there might be need of your Infallible Judge? Secondly, The Prophecies are not expressed in the Present Tense, which in proper the Jewes have not, but in the time past, to signifie the certainty of their accomplishment, and also, because as with God they are already done, since he looks upon all differences of time with one single act of intuition: and as for those Prophecies which respect Christ, they are so expressed, that thereby may be signified, that the merit of Christ did extend to some, even before the times wherein those particular promises were made, and therefore the manner of Prophetical expressions, is upon good reason easily discerned, if not by the people, yet by the Ministers of the Church, without an Infallible Judge.

And what then, if it speaks of Christ under the Type of *David*, when not onely the Letter signifies a thing, but the thing another thing, and one person represents another

ther? Is not this for the excellency of Scripture, without such obscurity, when we believe *David* was a Prophet, and those which spoke of him were Prophets, and when we are in Scripture directed to such an use of Types. And if any thing be spoken obscurely, yet if it be a matter necessary, there are other Texts more cafie to compare it with, and to expound it by, as your *Aquinas* in his first Page, 1. q. 9, 10. Articles. And therefore this exception is not able to argue the necessity of your Infallible Judge, no more then diversity, as you say of senses of Scripture; wherein it is to be understood; whereas there is but one sense of Scripture principally intended, which is expressed sometimes properly, sometimes improperly. As for the mystical Divinity, you know it is not argumentative, but where it is declared in Scripture. And as for the setting out of things Spiritual in way of Translation from things Temporal; you may consider it is necessary, if you will believe your Angelical Doctor, because, (since our Knowledge comes here by sense) we cannot for this state understand them, but by compare to things of sense: So that there must upon this account be Metaphors; and what are Allegories, but Metaphors continued? And as for the Tropological sense, which respects institution of life, that is not difficultly found in more clear precepts. Again, if by impropriety of speech, we should conclude an absolute need of an Infallible Judge, then how should we Infallibly be guided by the opinion of the Fathers, since so many of them, especially *Clemens Alexandrinus*, and *Origen* (who were of the antientest of them) are so full of this obscurity?

And as for your Objection, that both Precepts and Councils are delivered in the Mood Imperative; you cannot reasonably conceive that we should be so ignorant and credulous, as to think that we should swallow down, without chewing, this your supposition, that there are Counsells of Perfection, above things of Command, for when

we

we have done all, we must say that we are unprofitable Servants; we have done what we ought to do, St. Luke the 17. and 10. Unprofitable, not onely to God, (as your men distinguish) but also unprofitable to our selves, because we have done but our duty, if we did as much as we could, which none does, and yet if we did as much as we could, we should not do so much as we should, since the Commands of God are given to us, according to the tenour of our ability in Adam; which we lost by our own fault. Our obedience therefore, by it selfe, cannot be profitable.

Another default you will finde or make in Scripture, that it doth no where set down a Catalogue of Fundamentals. But do you think in earnest that this is a cogent argument for your cause? The Scripture doth not set down a Catalogue of Fundamentals, therefore it is not to be the Judge of Controversies.

To your Antecedent we say, that the Scripture doth give us every particular point which is necessary to be believed, although it doth not give out the Number thereof formall and material, how many and which they are.

Secondly, It doth not onely afford that which is simply necessary, but doth furnish us with many other particulars, so that it is an abundant directory for our use. And therefore is there no defect of Wisdome in this Law-maker, when he gives us such a Law that Infallibly contains all necessaries and more, and when those necessaries are not onely plainly delivered, but also what is not plainly delivered, is thereby signified not to be necessary.

Thirdly, Again, we admit humane dijudications of doubts emergent in some points, and they have their use with us, without Infallibility.

Fourthly, Either the Scripture yet, notwithstanding this, is it whereby we must be determined in points of Religion, or else the Church; but the Church by the same argu-

argument, is not the Judge, because it doth not define whatsoever may be necessary to be held by a full Catholique in your sense. Whether the Pope hath Temporal power or not, is not this necessary to be determined? if it be determined, how came your *Heart* to deny it? then whether he hath power Temporal directly, as the Canonists, or indirectly as others, is this determined? then how came *Bellarmin* to go against his Conscience on one side or other? for he varied herein, as your *Widdrington* speaks of him. And *Widdrington* he is another against his power, in his Apology for the right and Soveraignty of temporal Princes.

And why is not the question decided, whether the Pope be Superiour to a Council in things Ecclesiasticall, which the Sorbonists deny? Are not there high points which are of weight to move an Infallible Conclusion? Not to speak of Gods predetermination, or whether the Virgin *Mary* was Conceived without Original sin. How is then the Church the Infallible Judge of Controversies? If you say that the Church determines as much as is necessary; well then, and so hath the Scripture, which you acknowledge is Infallible: but are not the former points necessary? what can you instance in which is more necessary, and not determined in Scripture? If our Salvation, as you hold, be in jeopardy for not submitting to the Infallible Judge, what can be of more concernment then to know Infallibly who he is, and what power he hath, which yet your prudent Religion will never make a determination of?

After this you taxe our Doctrine to be contrary to Scripture, and first in the matter of Extream Unction by Saint *James*. We say (if you say right, that it is clear against us by Scripture) then the Scripture hath decided this question, then the Scripture can judge and end Controversies. And yet at the beginning hereof, you speak very warily and discreetly it seems. If by this term you would have us believe, that it is not evidently declared

against us in Scripture, then we need say no more as to this case. If it be manifest by Scripture against us, and you mean your word (*forms*) as *Aristotle* and others use it, in way of Elegance, or of course, then it doth not abate the tenure of the affirmative; and then what need we any other Judge? so are you held by this Dilemma. Secondly, That command of Saint *James* imports no Sacrament as you would have it; but doth relate to the gift of Healing in those times.

Another example of our difference from Scripture, you presse the Sacrament of the Lords Supper to be in our sense. We answer first, You say the words of Institution are clear in this Sacrament, in which any wise Man would speak clearly; and yet afterwards you say this Controversie the Scripture doth not decide. How far are these from a contradiction? if clear, then either is decided or needs none, but it is for your turn that it should be clear and not decided, clear against us: not decided for you. VVell here again you incur the former inconvenience, which I will let passe. Secondly, The words indeed are clear for the nature of a Sacrament, which under a visible signe represents a spiritual thing; and so therefore for the condition of a Sacrament, any wise man could not speak more conveniently then in a figurative sense, because it is symbolical to the Sacrament. For if the real presence as you mean, be corporal, then is the property of the Sacrament destroyed, because the signe is turned into that which is signified. And you are in more capacity to yeild a figurative sense here, because elsewhere you do object too much of it, and here too little. Indeed if Scripture had no other handling but yours, it would after it, more need an Infallible Judge. Is there no more likely-hood of a figurative sense in the words, then there is of the being of an Accident without the Subject, or of the Body of Christ, to be in Heaven and on Earth, and in thousands of places at once?

But

But you contend the improbability of this sense, because he took the Bread and the Cup in his hand, and said this is my Body, and this is my Bloud. Surely this makes no prejudice against us; for this was necessary towards the consecrating of that Bread and that Wine, otherwise there would have been a Consecration of Bread and VVine in *Common*, and therefore he spoke demonstratively, and this demonstration makes the Subject no lesse capable of a figure then the Prædicate; and what difference? *Behold the Lamb of God*, or *this is the Lamb of God*. So in the 9. to the *Hebrews* and the 20. verse, *Moses* having taken the Bloud of Calves and Goats said, *This is the Bloud of the Testament*. VVas that Bloud transubstantiated into the Bloud of Christ? or when one takes his Testament, may he not say this is my VVill, although it be but the signe of his Will.

You take notice also, of the different opinions there are about the sense of the words of Institution. We have no cause to take it to our selves, who have not such variety of conceits therein. Neither can you, I am sure, justifie your Infallibility by your accord herein, since some question whether it be transubstantiated, and therefore have they a proviso of a conditionate adoration, *Adoro te si tu es Christus*, and so many amongst you differ about the manner of the change; whether by production, which supposeth (as is noted) the Body not to præexiste, and this is false; or by addution, which supposeth against Transubstantiation, or by a kinde of Conservative Conversion, which is little else then a Contradiction *in adjecto*, therefore answer your self. How is it more clearly defined by the Church, which was scarce in debate till the time of *Berengarius*? Did the Church all that while want necessaries to Salvation? But lastly, you should not have pleaded Scripture for this point on your side, if you will believe *Scotus*, and your Cardinal *Bellarmine*; who sayes, that *Scotus* held Transubstantiation could not be clearly proved by

any Text of Scripture, and he himself thinks it not improbable. Therefore herein you cannot, in their judgement, convince us by Scripture, and therefore till the Church be Infallible, it is no doctrine of Faith; as it was not before the *Lateran Council*, as *Scotus* affirmed by *Bellarmine* Confession, in the 23. chapter of the third Book, *De Sacramento Eucharistiæ*: but if Transubstantiation be not declared in Scripture, then our opinion negative to you is more secure, and is not concluded not to be in Scripture, though you or others will not professe it.

In the former part of your 15. Number, you go over a former argument again, to which the former answer may serve. As for the other part of your Paragraph concerning all the points of Saint *Athanasius*'s Creed, which are not clearly delivered in Scripture, and yet he that will be saved must think thus. I answer, Although the matter of them be not *in terminis*, found in Scripture, yet the sense of them according to æquivalence may, as well as Transubstantiation, when you will endevour to make it out by Scripture. Secondly, Although we believe what is said in his Creed, yet therefore are we not bound to believe it by the Authority of the Church, since he would have held it, although the Church had not, as he did sometimes differ from the common profession of the Church, in the Consubstantiality of the Son of God.

In the beginning of the 16. Paragraph, you say somewhat which you had said before, to it we say nothing, but you raise a new opposition. Baptisme of Children to be necessary to their Salvation, is a prime point of Belief, and yet you cannot believe this prime point of Belief by any clear place of Scripture, therefore you mean all necessary points are not clearly believed by Scripture, therefore by the Church; this must be your dissertation, and your minor proposition you confirme by the Testimony of Saint *Austin*. We Answer, first to your Major, by distinguishing a necessity of Baptisme in general, it is necessary by necessity

necessity of precept, but it is not necessary by necessity of mean to the child, so as that if it be not baptized, it is undoubtedly damned; the former respects the Parents, that they should take care of it for their children, but if they do not, or the child be taken away as many are before it can be done by a lawful Minister, we cannot conclude it or them absolutely perished; since it is not so necessary to them that were of age at the Primitive Institution, Saint *Mark* the 16. 16. *Whosoever believeth and is Baptized, shall be saved, but he that believeth not, shall be damned*; not also, and is not Baptized: For many there were, and cases might be put, that there might be more which could not have Baptisme before they died as appears by your *Vicarium Baptisma*, which the Fathers speaks of. Then, though we may well assure our selves, that if Infants rightly Baptized die such, they are certainly saved: yet can we not as reasonably passe the Verdict of Damnation upon those which are not Baptized.

As to your assumption, we also distinguish, if you mean we cannot believe this *Pædobaptisme* by any clear place of Scripture, namely, *in terminis terminantibus*, as they speak expressly, we grant it: but this is not enough for your purpose. And if you mean it cannot be clearly believed, because by consequence it cannot be proved, or because it cannot be clearly beleeved since it is beleeved by consequence, then we deny your assumption in both regards. For whatsoever is necessarily inferred from Scripture is binding in the vertue of the principle, and therefore clearly we may beleeve it. Now the institution of Baptisme in general by Christ; the substitution of it to circumcision (since there is the same Covenant in substance to both Testaments) is a sufficient Principle to infer the necessity of Baptisme of Infants, besides what may be supposed by baptizing whole Families. And therefore this is none of those things which are not grounded in Scripture, and therefore no Object of the Church Tradition. And therefore

fore Saint *Austins* Testimony will come to no more then this, that though they had nothing for certain alledged out of the Canonical Books in this point, yet the truth of Scripture is kept when they do that which seemed good to the Catholique Church; namely, so far as the Catholique Church keepeth the Truth in clearing that which is not plain in Scripture. Which Church the Scripture doth commend, as he. But is it commended for infallibility? If not, this Testimony and all your Testimonies and all your instances which you have of things not determined in Scripture, but determined by the Church, will doe you no good, for you must prove that they were and ought to be infallibly determined by the Church upon necessity of salvation, because you would conclude your postulate of the necessity of an infallible Judge. Now then if those things were not infallibly determined, the instances thereof are of no use to you. And you may consider that we may in things of practice (which in their nature are of free Observation, as being neither commanded or forbidden by the Scripture) and should follow the Church therefore to bring it to an issue: Either this *Pædobaptisme* was infallibly followed by the Church or not, if infallibly, it was so by the moments of *Pædobaptisme* in Scripture, although not perspicuous. If not infallibly, yet might they follow the Church, and should in this Case, because if it had been free to them to have done so or not in regard of the thing, yet should they have gone in the way of the Church, when there was nothing to the contrary; much more should they conform in this which had that reason in the Analogy of Scripture; and therefore this Testimony of the Father need not move us, whersoever we find it; for I cannot find it by your direction. Give me some better direction to find the following of the Tradition of the Church to be the most true and inviolable Rule of Truth reduplicatively namely, upon its own account, and in things necessary; then I shall say more or yield.

He

He holdeth therefore (you say) the Tradition of the Church so infallible that it may be a ground of Faith. Here are two things to be said. First, that he holdeth so of Tradition, which by other Testimonies is to be proved. Since, Secondly, he doth not hold it therefore of Tradition; since these words of Saint *Austin* doe not draw after them the nature of Tradition in your sence; which doth not depend upon the written Word, as this doth for the reason of it.

And you believe Saint *Paul* taught him so in his second Epistle to the *Thessalonians*, 2.15. *Hold the Traditions which you have been taught, whether by word or by our Epistle.* To this we answer, premising the state of the Question, whether Doctrine of Faith not depending upon the word written do oblige Faith equally to Scripture. Now we say, that these Traditions might respect Order and Ceremony, or History, and so comes not within compass of the Question, in regard of the matter. Secondly, Though it will not please *Estius* upon the place, yet nothing hinders but that it might be meant of the same matter, which was first preached, then written, and then should hold it or them, as first preached, then written; and this is a second answer, in the place doth come into our question in respect of the matter; for the *Syriack* renders it, *Mandata, Commandements*, which do not signifie formally matters of Faith. Thirdly, The *Thessalonians* might be sure that what they had from him by word, was such as they should believe equally to what was written: but so cannot we be of your Doctrines of Faith which you say are handed from Generation to Generation. Make us as sure of them in regard of Divine Inspiration and communication to us, then urge our Obedience equal. And this will give you an account of Saint *Chrysostome* upon the place, who meaneth no otherwise, then that which they had from God by him, whether in word or writing they should hold, which they could beleeve; we can not for such Traditions, having not

that

that certainty of them. Read the whole of him upon that Text; and also do not passe by the Observation of his modesty herein: we may think it worthy of beleef, namely the Tradition of the Church, which whether he means it of things of Discipline and order (wherein we deny not conformity to the Church) we are not sure of; but there come not up to our Question: for they are not of Faith, and do not equally oblige.

And hitherto now you have gone about to assure Christians of a necessity of an infallible Judge, now in your 17. Paragr. you will assume that the Catholique Church, is the Judge. Then the Roman to be the Catholique prudently.

The text you name for the Catholick Church is that of Saint *Matthew* in his 16 Chap. the 18 Verse, *I say unto thee thou art* Peter (that is to S. *Peter* by name) *thou art* Peter (that is thou art a rock) *and upon this rock will I build my Church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it*, &c. And now surely you are at your strong hold, which you think cannot be undermined or stormed; true, if your application of it were as sure as it.

But we are not careful to answer you in this assault. First, we deny your interpretation of the name of *Peter*, you interpret the Greek, that is a rock; it is denied, the Greek word doth not ordinarily, and not here signifie a rock. And if you will not believe me, take this argument, *Cephas* signifieth a stone: ܟܐܦܐ (*Petrus*) signifieth as *Cephas*, therefore a stone. Both propositions you have proved, as you may see, in S. *John* 1. 42, 43. as in the Syriack, *Thou shalt be called Cephas*, that is a stone; ܐܢܬ ܬܬܩܪܐ ܟܐܦܐ, as in the Greek; which is interpreted ܟܐܦܐ, a stone. And because *Cephas* is known in Siriack to signifie a stone, therefore the Syriack doth not add these words [which is interpreted] and that *Petrus* signifieth as *Cephas* you have there; for *Cephas* is interpreted by *Petrus*, therefore your interpretation is not right.

Secondly, If you say, as you did before, that the Hebrew

brew was the Original of Saint *Matthew's* Gospel; then are you not nearly obliged to the *Syriack* which is but a dialect thereof: nay likely the very Dialect of *Hebrew* wherein it was first written, if not in *Greek*, and then not onely can you not interpret כיפא *A Rock*, but כיפא neither; and then you cannot render the following words as you do, *And upon this Rock*, &c. For the words in the *Syriack* are letter for letter the same; both the name of the Apostle; and the word which you render *a Rock*, are the same, כיפא both; and therefore if you will stand to the *Syriack*, it will come to this, *Thou art a stone, and upon this stone will I build my Church*. And this will have fair Correspondence with that of Saint *Paul* in the same Metaphor, *Ephes.* 2. 20. *Built upon the Foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone*. So that the priviledge of Saint *Peter* here was onely this, to lay as it were the first stone, in this Foundation. Nay thirdly, πετρος in the New Testament more then once signifieth *a stone*, *Rom.* 9. last. it is synonymically joyned there with λιθος, [illegible] where πετρα is joyned also to the same Metaphor, in that it is said πετραν σκανδαλου; for this must signifie *a stone of offence*; for whoever stumbled at *a Rock*? and therefore a scandal in the Church is by *Aquinas* defined by that which gives to others an occasion of falling. So also in the very same manner are they put together by Saint *Peter* himself in his 1. Ep. 2. Verse 8. And we have reason to think that Saint *Peter* did understand the sense of Christs words to him, and the reason of his name.

And thus for your Interpretation of this Text.

As for the application of it, we say first, whereas you referre this to the Person of Saint *Peter*, you may know that you differ from the Ancients, who did refer it to the Confession of Saint *Peter*, and not to his act of his Confession, as his; but as to the Object, which was confessed, which your *Isidor Clarius* may be thought to aim at, when he Expounds, *super hanc Petram, super hanc fidei soliditatem.*

For *Piscator* notes well that this rock cannot be meant of Saint *Peter*; because S. *Peter* is one of the believers which were built upon this rock. And therefore one hath a conceit that Christ spake [this rock] *Demonstrando*, pointing at himself; as where he sayes destroy this Temple, pointing at his body, and so the copulative may be understood by way of Ebraisme; and upon this rock, that upon this rock. Secondly, as Saint *Peter* spake here for the rest of the Apostles; where that which is granted is common to him with the rest of the Apostles, as that which follows; and I will give thee the Keyes of the Kingdome of Heaven: unlesse you can Evince it that that which is here promised or given to Saint *Peter*, is really different from that which is given to all the Apostles in the 20. of Saint *John*, the 22, 23. verse, and then shall you do more then your *Hare* in his Colloque with *Rainolds*. There is the same power and authority under the same Metaphor; For what difference will you make betwixt binding and retaining, and loosing or remitting? so then let me ask you this question: was the primacy of authority given to Saint *Peter* here at that time, or after the Resurrection given, here promised? If given here, then after this privileges of Infallibility, Saint *Peter* denyed his Master; therefore somebody of yours, and *Bellarmine*, as I remember, wisely imagineth, that this authority was given to Saint *Peter* after his Resurrection, that so the successors of Saint *Peter* might not have the possibility of denying Christ ensailed upon them: If promised there, given then, where will you finde any Text more symbolical then that of the 20. of Saint *John* forenamed; and that was given to the Apostles *communiter*. Therefore if [I will give] respects the future, and after the Resurrection of Christ, as *Isidor Clarius* doth note; then confesse it to be accomplished here, or name any Text, which hath better allusion thereunto. And if the Superiority of Saint *Peter* was neither given nor promised here, where then

then? and why is this Text made to bear false witnesse by you for you.

Thirdly, This Superiority of Saint *Peter* in jurisdiction, as to be Prince of the Apostles, as your men speak, is flatly contrary to our Saviours own Order in the 20. of Saint *Matthew*, the 25. verse; for when *James* and *John* the sons of *Zebedee*, were petitioned for by their mother for preheminency; Our Saviour said, *Ye know that the Princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, & those that are great exercise authority upon them; but it shall not be so amongst you.* Then here is the Controversie determined by our Saviour in Scripture. St. *Peter* then was not to have any authority over the rest. Not that from hence can be argued, that there should be no one Superior to Presbyters, as Sectaries would urge it; but none of all the Apostles to be superior, to have dominion, to exercise authority over the other of the Apostles. Here is a plain Text for the parity of the Apostles, which destroyes the foundation of the Roman Church, which now you speak for.

Fourthly, Put case Saint *Peter* had been constituted Prince of the Apostles, and of the Church consequently, yet have you another infinite labour to make good the succession of these priviledges to the Bishop of *Rome* by Divine Right. Why not rather to *Antioch* and *Jerusalem*; since also by a Divine Faith we cannot be ascertained, that Saint *Peter* was ever at *Rome*. We do not deny it, but yet by you it is not made out to be an object of Divine Faith, that he was there. And to name no other prejudices against you in this, you are put to very hard shifts for the proof thereof, when you are compelled to interpret *Babylon* in the 1 Ep. 5. c. & 13. v. of St. *Peter* to be *Rome*. Certainly had your men any other Text for it, they would not have given us this occasion and example to interpret *Babylon* in another place to be *Rome*. And yet also *Isidor* is somewhat tender in this Exposition, it is not very likely, saith he, that it should be understood of

that *Babylon*, of the *Assyrians*, or that in *Egypt*, but it is *admodum credibile*, very credible that it is meant of *Rome*.

And *Estius* upon the place cites the first Author for this Interpretation of it to be *Rome*, to be the same who was the Father of the Milinary Opinion, namely *Papias*. But fifthly, The former Text of Saint *Matthew* is not to be meant of any Church of one Denomination, and if so, it had been meant of one not of *Rome*. For then the promise had not been made good of not falling into damnable errours, for so the gates of Hell should prevail against it. The gates of Hell have prevailed against the Church of *Rome*, Head and Members, as you may see more at large in the Discourse of *Reynolds* with *Hart*. What say you to *Liberius* his subscribing to the censure of *Athanasius*, and did not he subscribe to the errour then which *Athanasius* withstood? And were not the Members included in the Head? And ought not they to do so as he under peril of damnation? But sixthly, whereas you say that by Christ the Church is secured from any damnable errour, we have enough against you by this intimation, if you mean it distinctively, as methinks you do. For you insinuate here that Christ doth not intend her exemption from all errour, for then you are in greater danger of not being the Church unto which that Favour is granted: but he doth here free it from damnable errour, because else the gates of Hell should prevail against it: So then again it is not necessary to salvation to be free from all errour. Well, then upon these two concessions that the Church of Christ may be obnoxious to errour, though not damnable, because again, every errour doth not damne, we exclude the infallibility of the Church, for it may erre it seems: and also we exclude the necessity of such an infallibility, for we may be saved notwithstanding some errours, and what need then of an infallible Judge since in points of question simple errour is not damnative?, and where indeed shall we have

an

an infallible Judge, if there be fallibility at any particular? If the Spirit of God speaks in the Church by infallible assistance, cannot the Spirit of God infallibly determine all points? or if it assists infallibly only to material Articles which are necessary, then do you give us a list of your Fundamentals. And also for Fundamentals we need not such a Judge, having them with sufficient plainnesse in Scripture which is Infallible. Upon the whole matter then, there is a possibility of their erring without Infallibility, and of our erring without damnation: So that your first error is an Infallibility of a Judge; the second, the necessity of such a Judge; and a third is this, that no Church can prudently be held to be the Catholick Church, but the Roman.

But ought we not to disturb your delight, you take in holding a Religion prudently? prudently as if we were to choose a Religion by interesse, which prudence doth rather direct to, not by sapience of the highest speculative principles, which direct the understanding: but to let that passe. We onely note hereby your pronouncing this main Text, for the Authority of the Church, that what Authority it hath, must be resolved into Scripture, then is that the first and highest principle. That the center of Truth, wherein we must rest, and the further we go from that, the further from Truth. And the greater circumference we draw, the lines are the remoter from that, wherein we must acquiesce, as being the Word of God.

Yet you say here we see the Judge, which Christ hath warranted from bringing in any damnable error, therefore may we securely obey. So you. But where is your connexion in this argumentation? Either you distinguish damnative error against that which is not damnative, or not. If not, then in your opinion all error is damnative; then take you heed of this, for this is one. Or if you do distinguish it against error damnative, yet may we not securely obey this Judge, because then we may be bound

to obey him in an error, and so should the understanding be obliged to assent to error, which is impossible, and he must act against his Conscience, even in his assent, which is a contradiction.

And that none may disobey this judge securely, the Text you bring *Matth.* 18. 17. will not evince to your purpose. Firstly, it concerns matters of Trespasse betwixt Brother and Brother, not matters of Faith, and thus it is Ecclesiastical to your designe. Secondly, It concerns refractorinesse of the person, not unbelief of the Understanding; and so the Authority of the Church may binde against the former, though not against the latter. Thirdly It respects Excommunication by censure, not determination of a point by Infallibility, and so also is not proper to your cause. And fourthly, It may erre in the Censure, and therefore Excommunication, *ex ipso*, doth not damne, as Unbelief may. Neither am I bound to believe the Censure is just, unlesse it appears to be so. Fifthly, This power belongs to every particular Church, and to the several Prelates thereof (as you speak also in the number of multitude) and therefore is not appropriated to your Church. Sixthly, It doth not follow, *a fortiori*, as you would have it, nor yet at all, that because the Church is to judge of private complaints, therefore it can judge infallibly in causes of greater importance: by its authority it doth the former, without Infallibility it does not the latter. The former of them doth not conclude against me, and the latter cannot be from hence collected. As for that which follows, *whatsoever you shall bind on earth, shall be bound in Heaven*, as far as it regards Excommunication, must be also taken specificatively, *& clave non erranti*, as they speak. And this toucheth the person unto the submission, not the Conscience; as to renounce that which it apprehendeth as true: for then should *Athanasius* have been bound in Conscience by the Censure of the Church to have been an *Arian*.



Then

Thus from the point of disobedience to the Judge, you gather that this must suppose the Judge not to be fallible in such prime causes, as must concern the Church; and all such causes are those which may bring in damnable errors. So you in the end of that Number.

But your premises being destroyed, your Conclusion is ruinous, and you do not conclude generally, according to an Elench, for your Church is not fallible in prime causes of such importance: but you should in your proof conclude it infallible in all things, for if it be fallible in any thing wherein the error is not damnative, then you do not conclude it infallible. Your thesis is, that it should not err actually in any decision; your consequent runs from hence, that it is infallible. Now Infallibility includes all error in whatsoever such proposition or decree, and the possibility of error. Therefore prove it thus, and then infallibility of our knowledge of it, and infallibility what is the subject of this Infallibility, and then shall bring up to your Creed. And if you would go the right way in this dispute, you should use another method: for whereas you would argue the Church to be the judge, which we cannot safely disobey; if you could make the Pope (which yet is not done yet) you should rather go this way formally, the Church is infallible in whatsoever it doth define, therefore it is the Judge which we ought to obey in all things whatsoever it shall do or but your discourse from uncertain decisions and inconveniences doth not bespeak any credence of your infallibility, much lesser of our knowledge thereof.

Now we follow you into your eighteenth paragraph. And here we meet with [illegible] in his 20. [illegible] where he comments upon these words of [illegible] and what from hence? Because the Pope is judge on earth, therefore infallibly, then every Church which hath Prepositi, should be

Infal-

Infallible. Doth this follow? we deny not their Judicature, but their Infallibility. Conclude thus, or you agree with us.

Then you fly to the Old Testament, *Mal. 2. 7.* For the *Priests lips shall keep knowledge, and they shall require the law from his mouth.* So you. And you note, besides a great corruption in our English, which rendreth the words, *the Priests lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek the law.* We need not answer that this Text hath nothing for you; Is it meant of the Priests at Rome? If not, how belongeth it to you? but to the Priests of the Church? what in general? what then do you get by this? Secondly They keep Knowledge sufficiently for the people. Do they keep it Infallibly? If not we are agreed. If infallibly, how are the Priests taxed in the following words for not doing so? And if the formality of speech doth import a promise in the future, not a duty in the Subjunctive: yet the promise doth not include an impossibility of error; no more then the promise made to your Church, as you suppose, doth exclude all error, but that which is destructive. Thirdly, The future in the Hebrew, doth not contradict a subjunctive in the interpretation, when the scope bears it, since the Hebrew, as you may know, have no proper Subjunctive. And it is proper to the scope to understand it as of duty, they should keep knowledge, wherenpon they are charged for breach of duty, therefore our Interpretation in this, is more sound then your dispute upon it.

And therefore that which you say in your 19. Number, that any man may ask the Priests of the Church, what is the Known Doctrine of the Church, & then let him rest securely; when he knowes that, that is unreasonable, because the Priests are not Infallible. May he not rest more securely in Scripture: for the Church in all things is not as before infallible, the Scripture is, in all which it proposeth: but the Church you say, is not in danger of taking in any damnative

native error. Well, but the Scripture sets out none at all; but all things are not determined in Scripture. Well, but all things are not determined in the Church; but all things necessary are taught in the Church, which may keep us from damnative error. Well, and are not all things necessary taught in the Scripture? why then not to the Law and Testimony? why to the Cistern, when we may have it at the Fountain? why not to the Scripture particularly, when what Authority the Church hath, it hath from the Scripture in general? and why doth your Church take away from the people the use of Scripture? and why may not we be informed as sufficiently by our Priests, as you by yours, notwithstanding this Text? especially since we go by Scripture, you by Tradition, or humane definition. And if the Priests of yours were Infallible, can you say Infallibly that they will not deceive you? How miserably then do you provide for the poor people? when you would have them require at their mouth, not the Law of God, but the Doctrine of the Church.

That which comes on in the same Number about Tradition before Scripture, was answered before it was written. The Word, in the Substance of it, was before the Church which was begotten by it, and when there is now as much need, and as great certainty of Tradition as formerly, then urge it.

And I thank you for Saint *Irenæus*'s Testimony, I do not lye at catch; but the most convincing dispute, is by our Adversaries principles; not the Fathers but yours, as you apply them, for we can make very good use of his words. If the Scripture had not been left to us, we should have had Tradition more certainly conveyed to us, as the Gospel was before it was written, and this confirmes for me what was said before: but now I assume, the Scripture is now left to us, therefore is there no need of certain conveyance of Tradition to us. Surely you have a minde to help us for your own good.

Neither can we believe that those barbarous Nations you speak of, did rely onely upon Tradition, they might be commended to the doctrine of the Gospel by Tradition, and then not believe it for the sake of Tradition, for this is the state of the question: Tradition in matters of Faith unwritten, is of equal authority to Scripture. Secondly, If you say Salvation was written in their hearts by the Holy Ghost, this may be meant to be done not onely beside Scripture, but besides Tradition, and thus was it done extraordinarily. But why? Thirdly, Might not the Holy Spirit infuse Faith of the Gospel into those Nations, by some of those who were Apostles, or sent from them to Preach it; and then the Tradition you speak of is the matter of the Gospel which is written, and so it doth not appertain to the question of Traditions of proper name, which you say are beside that which is written, though not against it; and then your discourse is fallacious from that which is the object of the Gospel delivered, to that which is beside it delivered, which ambiguity of the word Tradition if it doth deceive you, yet doth it not consequently deceive me: but if you mean Tradition here, onely of the manner of communicating the matter of Scripture without writing, then the former answer may satisfie you, that Tradition was then more certain, and they were more assured of it by the Spirit of God then we are now. And also it might be to them, as the Star to the Wise Men for leading them to Christ. By the light of the Star they were guided to Christ, but when they came to him, they saw him not by the light of the Star, but by the light of the Day: so some might be directed to the Gospel by Tradition before they had the Scripture, and then believed it by the light of Scripture.

You add also, neither did the Apostles or their Successors take any care to have the Scripture communicated to all Nations in such Languages, as they could all,

all, or the greater part understand. So you. This is readily denyed: for God did take care that the New Testament should for the most part of it at least be first written in Greek. And the Greek you know in the notion of the New Testament, is contradistinguished to the Jew, because so many of the world, besides the Jews, were Greeks; and the Greeks Language was the most common then, and therefore saith *Tully* in his Oration for the Poet *Archias*, *Graca per totum orbem leguntur*. And God by his gracious Providence, hath taken care that the Scripture should be translated into divers languages, as you may know, that so several Nations might have it familiar to them in their own Tongue; which must condemn your Church, for not permitting of it ordinarily to the people in their own dialect: and also doth conclude, that Tradition is not infallible provision for a rule of Faith, for how shall the people undoubtedly know that the Traditions were clearly discerned, true from them which were false; and also that they were faithfully handed through so many Centuries to the present time. And yet if so, this would not be sufficient for your use, unlesse you or others could finde these two points more, one how to evade a Circle, by proving the Traditions by the Church, and the Church by the Traditions; and the second this, that those Traditions have infallibly decided the differences betwixt us, which the Antients did not professedly handle, as having not provocations thereunto. If any thing be touched by the by, you may know the rule, *Aliud agenti parum auctoritas*.

In your 20. Number, you make a recapitulation of what you think you have done, and I think you have undone, untill you come to

Sixthly, I have found a lawful Judge, who can be informed of all Controversies arising from time to time, and who can hear Me and You, and be heard by Me and You: that neither I nor you can doubt of the true meaning of

this Church, or if we doubt, we can propose our doubt, and she will tell us clearly her meaning, whereas the Bible, &c. cannot do so.

This hath in it somewhat new: your discourse in brief, may be under this forme. That which can hear you and me, and be heard by you and me, and resolve doubts of its meaning, is the Judge, the Church can do thus, the Scripture not, therefore the Church is the Judge, and not the Scripture.

We easily answer, If you understand the proposition of a formall Judge, so we grant it, and do not say the Scripture is the Judge, but if you mean it so that nothing can be in any Kind a Judge, but that which doth so, we deny it and your assumption too; for the Law is in its kind the Judge, and so may the Scripture be, as I have shewed before in this paper. And unless the Ecclesiastick Judges (whereof we do not reject a lawfull and good use) doe rightly declare Scripture in the application of it to particular Causes, (wherein the authority of the Church, as some of your men will sometimes say, doth consist) I cannot possibly hold my self bound in Conscience to yield my judgement thereunto. So then secondly, unlesse you put into the premisses, that that which heareth you and me, and is heard by you and me, is the infallible Judge, and then that the Church doth so, your discourse is peccant in the ignorance of the Elench, for so we grant all as to the Church, for this may stand with our cause, but if you do put in infallibility, we deny both the one and the other Prepositon. Thirdly, by this Argument you exclude Tradition from being the Judge: for doth that hear you and me? Is that heard by you and me? but you say the Church doth determine hereby, then may it determine by Scripture more securely, and more universally. Fourthly, is not the Heretique Saint *Paul* speaks of in his third chapter to *Titus* the 10. 11. verses, αὐτοκατάκριτος, condemned by himself, or of himself? how that? not by principles of natural Know-

Knowledge: for *Theologie* is supernatural, and therefore needed a Revelation of it from God, you know not by a Revelation immediate *Extra Scripturam*: for then how should he be condemned of himself? Nor by any definition of the Church, which was not then sufficiently formed thereunto: no nor yet by *Titus*; because then as before, he had not been condemned by himself; then he was condemned by himself, because he had in him the Principles of the Word of God, which he gainsaid by his contrary Error: So that it remains he was condemned by the Law of God. And therefore that can judge you and me; not externally, and by voice: but internally by vertue of Conscience; which can and does and should apply the truths of God to the censure and condemning of Errors in us; so that this Scripture it is, or the Word of God which passeth Sentence in the interiour judgement, as you speak, and this absolves some who in the outward Courts are condemned; and condemneth some who in the outward Court are not condemned. And therefore it is not only lawful, but necessary for us sometimes to dissent in our judgement, because they may erre in their dijudication.

And as much your own reason suggests in your 21. Number; wherein you acknowledge it to be necessary that there should be infallibilitie in the Judge of faith; And then you would state or estate this infallibility of the Church of Christ thus, that a Pope defining with a Lawful Generall Councill cannot erre. For it is no necessary article of faith to believe that the Pope or Head of the Church cannot Erre when he defineth without a Generall Councill. So you.

Alas, Sir what Cautions do you stand in need of in this grand and capital and Comprehensive Controversie; which affords me Liberty to think, that that is not the ground of Catholique Faith, which is intricated with so many windings; and guarded with such accurateness of Cautions, that

that render it very suspicious; and therefore not to be plain and a direct way so that fools cannot erre: for who can be certain by a Divine Faith of the Lawfullness and regularitie of your Pope in his Creation, and when there was Pope against Pope, who of the people could distinguish the right? And this is now possible because then *in facto*. And who then could decide the question: for the infallible judge you say is your Pope with a Council. Which of them could then determine it and in his own cause? Or could your Council determine it without a Pope? but I hope your infallible determination could not be without the Head of the Church; And who according to your Doctrine, should call the Council? for you say that power is vested in the Pope; Well, suppose no doubt of the legalitie of the Pope; how shall we by a Divine faith come to be assured of the lawfulness and Generality of a Councill? for you know Ecclesiastical History is full of instances of Councils, which were called by the Emperours and not by Popes, to whom you say it doth of due belong to call Councils, else they are not lawful. And how shall we know whether every one of the Council hath a free Election to it, and a free decisive vote in it? How much of faction may be looked for in a Councill, when there is so much in the Election of a Pope, such exclusions, such handyings? What Council was ever called by a Pope wherein Religion was not made to serve his intereſt? Is not he who hath power of preferring like to domineer in such Consultations? And how shall ignorant souls be divinely perswaded that the Council is General? If it be easie to discern it, then had your *Trent* Council great infelicity to be so contradicted by the *French* Catholiques. And how many Bishops in the *Trent* Council furnished with a Title to overpower them with Votes on the Popes behalf. So that he answered well who said about the question which is superiour, a Pope or a Council; a Pope was like to have the more voyces, because he could

could confer Bishopricks, a Council not. What clue can a collier have infallibly to guide him through all those Labyrinths?

Secondly, If the infallible Judge of Faith be the Pope with a lawful General Council, how was the Church provided for? when for so many years there was neither Pope in your sense, nor any Council?

Thirdly, If the Pope and the Council do differ about a Question, what shall be done in that case? yet if the Question be which is superiour to the other, the Pope or the Council, what shall be joyntly agreed? and is not this a main question between the Sorboniſts and others?

Fourthly, If the Pope with a lawful General Council be the infallible Judge, then how will this be reconciled to the *Pontificians*, who assert the Government of the Church to be Monarchical by Christs Institution: for if part of the authority be in the General Council, then is it not all in one, the Pope. Or if the Council be called onely *ad Consilium*, and they have no Votes decisive, how doth this agree to all the former Councils, wherein they had authority of Vote; and he may determine without them as to advise, since he determins without them in the authority; and suppose they advise him to let them have power of Vote; he can yet determine against them.

Fifthly, How many Councils have been opposite to one another. In which or with which did not the Pope erre? The *Nicene* and that of *Ariminum* as before decreed, contrarily; one for the *Arrians*, the former against them, which did not erre, and yet if neither had, did ever any of the ancient Councils determine of their own infallibility?

And what think you of *Nazianzens* Opinion about Councils, in his Epistle, to *Procopius*, the 42. Shall I tell you it? I have no mind to derogate from General Councils, but if you would have me tell you his judgement, it is in such words, ἔχω μὲν ὅστις, &c. I am thus affected, as to shun all meetings of Bishops (if I must speak the truth)

for

for I never saw any Good end of a Synod, nor that had an end of the Evils more then an addition. Nay, did not the Bishop of *Bitonto* break out into these words in the face of the Council at *Trent*; *I would that with one consent, we had not altogether declined from Religion, to superstition, from Faith unto infidelitie from Christ unto Antichrist, from God to* Epicurus. Did he not say so?

And this may serve for your Answer to all the rest of this your Paragraph. We cannot think it strange that the definition of a General Council should be fallible, until you bring forth your strong reasons to induce my assent, that such assistance was ever promised to a General Council, as the Apostles and Prophets had; or that any General Council had such assistance; or that there was the same reason of such assistance.

And to say no more of this point, measure the infallibility of the *Trent* Council by the determinations thereof in things of Religion, and see how they agree with Scripture; which you say is a rule of Faith: and by this Argument be you judge of the infallible Judge. Let us not see your Opinions by infallibility which you pretend: but do you see your infallibility by the determinations it did put forth; namely such wherein we differ, and therefore I need not name them.

In the 22. Paragraph we have recapitulation, and a passage of *Luther*, which you use as an Argument *ad hominem*.

We Answer, you do then hereby give us occasion to shew our ingenuity to truth, that as we follow him and any other with it, so we will not follow others or him without it. But secondly, If this book was written after his recession from the Church of *Rome*, it is not meant of the *Roman* Church, but of the Catholique Church; which yet he doth not here compare with the Scripture, but with a private man; which seems to be spoken against *Enthusiasts*. Neither doth he say that it is not lawful to doubt of the Church,

Church that whatsoever it saith is true, but that it hath the Revelation of the Father; to wit because it hath the revealed Word of God with it. Or that the undoubtedness of it doth not belong to it *per se*, but *per aliud*, because it hath for its privilege the Revelation of Scripture? And thus it maketh not for you.

Now this brings on your forecited passage of Saint *Paul* to *Tim.* 1. 3. 15. Where the Church of God is called *the Pillar and Ground of Truth.*

And you ask, *May we not rely securely upon the pillar of Truth? May they not ground themselves assuredly on the ground of Truth? Is ground being surer ground and more infallible then the ground of Truth it self?* So you;

Supposing the words read according to this way, we answer, There is a double Pillar, and a double ground; one Principal, the Scripture; the other lesse principal and subordinate, the Church; now as this pillar and this ground is subordinate to the main pillar and ground, we may rely and ground our selves: but then the principal reliance and grounding must be upon that which is principal, the Scripture. For let me ask you likewise, what is the Pillar and Ground of the Church? Is it not the Scripture? then the Church is but the pillar and ground by accident, because that doth rely and is grounded upon the Scripture. And therefore the Scripture is the more sure and infallible ground: because what truth the Church hath it hath by participation, and it is possible for it to hold forth and to have hung upon it somwhat which is false, according to your own confession (as I conceive you) although not damnative. And this doth well corroborate my inference from Saint *Irenæus* words of the Scriptures being called the Pillar and Ground of Truth, that therefore it is the Ground of Faith, yes very rationally, because it is the prime and supreme pillar and ground of Truth. Yet you will raise a consequence upon mine for your cause, thus. If this consequence be strong (which I deny not) there is yet

a stronger, that the Truth is no where surer grounded then upon the pillar and foundation of Truth. So you.

Sir, What do you mean? Do you make any difference betwixt the ground and foundation? Do you mean that the Scripture is the ground of Faith, but the Church is the Foundation? This is your sense I suppose, otherwise how a stronger Consequence? For there is no comparative, but where there is some difference. And if this be what you would have, then I think I may say, I have what I would have, and yet we are not agreed. For then you confesse what I have hitherto held, that the Scripture is the ground of Faith. You said at first that the authority of the Church was the ground of Faith: I said the Scripture was the ground of Faith; and now you say as I say, that the Scripture is the ground of Faith, and so your contradiction is come into my affirmation. But yet we are not agreed in that which you now superadd, that the Church is the Foundation of Truth; the Scripture is the Ground, the Church the Foundation. Is it so? then have you changed the Question. And why had we not the right state of it at first? And was it not enough that the Church should be the ground of Scripture, but must it be the Foundation in a more excellent sense? I must not let this passe for your sake.

First, what gives you occasion from the Text to assert the Church to be the Foundation, *siquanter*, I do not see. For the word in the Greek ἑδραίωμα doth not signifie a Foundation, but that which doth uphold, support against falling; and therefore, *Isidor Clarius* and *Estius* doe interpret it by *firmamentum*, not *fundamentum*. So the Church holds forth, and holds up the Truth. Therefore your meaning of Foundation above ground, hath neither Foundation nor ground.

Secondly, can you conceive and say, that the Church is a Foundation of Truth comparatively to Scripture? Is not the Scripture the Foundation of the Church? The Scripture

in

in the substance of the Word, was before the Church, because the Church was built upon it; then the Scripture in the substance of it, was the Foundation, and is now, being written. And that which is the first Principle of all must be the Foundation of the rest; and the further we go from it, the lesse security we have, because we go more into discourse which is uncertain. Now the first Principle is Scripture, not the Church; because the Church is proved by Scripture, and you proved even now, or would have done, the authority of it by Scripture. The Church may give Testimony of the Scripture: but the Scripture doth not onely give Testimony of the Church, but doth ground it, and constitute it, and distinguish it, and upon it it is built, then this is the Foundation. The Church is built upon the Scripture, not the Scripture upon the Church. As the Law hath it self to Justice, so hath the Scripture it self to Faith. Now the Law is the Foundation of Justice, not the Judge: so is the Scripture the Foundation of Faith, not the Church, which you say is the Judge. For as the Judge is built upon the Law, so is the Church upon Scripture. And as the Judge is to go by the Law in his proceeding and sentence, otherwise he erres; so is the Church to go by the Law of Scripture, otherwise it doth erre. And as the Law is not to be proved, it being the first Principle in Justice, so is not the Scripture to be proved; for it is the first principle in Faith. But as the sentence of the Judge may be examined by Law, so may the determinations of the Church be examined by Scripture, since the Judge may erre, and so may the Church. But first prove that it hath not erred, and then you will have another work to do to prove it cannot: For the Faith of a Christian immediately is resolved into that which cannot deceive him. And prove that it cannot erre, and therefore is the infallible Judge; or if you can, prove it the back way; it is the infallible judge, therefore cannot erre.

Nextly, You make some restriction of my Criticisme

(if it may be so called) and yet not mine neither, but of others also; whereby the termes, the Pillar and Ground of Truth, is referred to the commendation of the Mystery of Godlinesse, after the *Hebrew* fashion, to give these Prefaces of respect to so grand and sublime doctrines.

Here you are pleased to smile, as if I had forgotten that this Epistle was written in *Greek*, not in *Hebrew*, and also you say no *Hebrew* form in the world can make that sense he intends.

Sir, Will you please to give me leave to be even with you in a smile? but no, I have no minde to rejoyce in any mans imperfections. Soberly I reply, that I do well remember in what Language it was written, and therefore I make it to be an Ebraisme, in our use of the word, which speaks a following of the *Hebrew* form in some other Language. And he that doth not understand that there is many of these Ebraismes in the Greek of the New Testament, doth not understand so much as I would desire. And therefore, that which you say, that no Hebrew form can make my sense, is not to be answered. And to follow you, although the Apostle had not spoken yet of Godlinesse, or the mystery of it, might he not put this form of commendation in the front of the Doctrine of Godlinesse? as as also in the first Epistle to *Timothy*, 1 *Tim.* 1.15. *This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ* &c.

Neither have you any cause to object the reading of the words in our English, since the distinction of Verses is not Canonical, nor yet our English so accounted by us, notwithstanding we have as much reason for it, to make it as good as your Latin.

But your Adversary sayes, you say, that this Title of being the Pillar and ground of Truth, agrees in the first place to Scripture. Yes, and so I do still, and have shewed it so: but you say it belongeth equally to any thing that is the true Word of God, and therefore agreeth to the

the Scriptures, because God speaketh in it and by it. Right, hold you there. Rest your self here. See up your staffe here, for you can go no further, unlesse you will go up to Heaven, and the Church Triumphant.

But God also speaketh by his Church, and in his Church; yes, unto Authority, not Infallibility, and therefore that which followes, remaines to be proved by you; that he doth give as much Infallible assistance to the Church in a Council (where is the Pope? have you a minde to the opinion of the French Catholiques?) as he gave to him who did deliver his Word in Scripture. It is utterly denyed. And you may see plainly hereby how the Roman Tyranny over your Conscience (as they would perswade you) draws you necessarily into this perill of Blasphemy: for herein it appears, that now there is no need of Scripture, since God speaks as Infallibly by his Church, as in his Word. And this some *Pontificians* do lean towards. And then those by you should be called *Enthusiasts*, not who oppose a private Revelation to Scripture, but to the Church; if God speaks as infallibly by his Church, then speak no more against *Enthusiasmes*, or if you do, we shall tell you the story, that one was accused to *Alexander* for being a Pirate; so then said he that was accused to *Alexander*, I am a Pirate with one Fly-boat, and you are not, because you have a Navy. So the private men are by you accounted *Enthusiasts*, because they have but their own singularities for their bottom: but the Church of *Rome* is not to be charged therewith, because they have so many with them. And yet it may be, if Infallibility were to be determined by Votes, whether it did belong to the Words of God onely, or also to the Word of the Church, you would go neer to lose it, for all Churches hold the Scripture Infallible, and you too: but no Church but the Roman holds the Church to be Infallible, and then also you must assume that you are the Church, otherwise you would not hold it Infallible.

You say again, it is objected, that in these words, rather the office of the Church is set forth then her Authority. To which you say, your answer is clear, that her Authority cannot possibly in short words be more set out, then by saying that she is the Pillar and Ground of Truth, &c.

But the question is, whether these words be intended to that purpose, since also the words do in short fully represent the office of the Church: the intention of the passage must be gathered by the scope, according to the rule of the Schoolman, *Intelligentia dicti colligitur ex scopo loquendi.* Now the drift of Saint *Paul*, was to instruct him how he should carry himself in the Church. Was it reasonable then he should have account of the Church in the priviledges of it, or in the duty thereof; which is to hold forth, and uphold truth? For if the Infallibility of the Church were here affirmed, then needed he not to have such instructions to take care how he behaved himself in the Church. Since Infallible assistance is immediate, and that which is immediate, includes no time for the inspiration, nor means of instruction: therefore had your Roman Church been real in the asserting of Infallibility, it had not needed eighteen years for the sitting of the *Trent* Council, with Intermissions, nor more for the consultation whether there should be any.

As for that which comes next of *Athanasius*, it was in part answered before: the Argument is this, the Consubstantiality of the Son is by *Athanasius*, after the determination of the *Nicene Council*, called that Word of God, by the *Nicene Council*, which remaineth for ever and ever. And this is no where clearly said in Scripture, therefore somewhat which is not clearly said in Scripture, may by a Council be determined to be the Word of God. To this we answer, we may grant you all of the Syllogism, and yet nothing accrews to you, if the words by the *Nicene Council* be understood ministerially to Scripture, which they were bound to declare the sense of, as to that point,

and

and so it did not binde with relation to their Authority, but by Authority of Scripture, which they declared the mind of in that case. And therefore though so we grant the Argument, yet do we deny your Consequence which you would make of it in your sense, that the Church is infallible in the definitions of it, since that which was defined was indeed Infallible, and yet was not Infallibly defined: for though the Council did not erre in that definition, yet it might have erred: and if it did not erre in that, yet it might erre in other definitions: and therefore can we not without suspense, intuitively receive what they propose as the Word of God, which is by you yet to be proved. For secondly, That which they have the Principles and Grounds of Scripture for, it is more easie for them rightly to define, in the Application of those principles unto particular cases, as they had for that question about the Consubstantiality of the Son, as Saint *John* the 10. 30. *I and my Father are one*; not ἓν but ἕν, not one Person, but one in Nature: but as for those questions, whereof the solution is not so principled in Scripture, as being not so necessary to be held on either part; we cannot expect so likely a determination, and yet if probable, we cannot from thence urge it as an object of Faith. That which is in Scripture, according to equivalence of sense (as that point is) we may better credit upon account of Scripture, then that which the ignorance of doth not damn, since the Scripture gives us no moments of knowledge how to order our assent affirmatively or negatively in that.

But thirdly Saint *Athanasius* did not ground his Faith in the affirmative of that question upon the authority of the *Nicene Council*, because he held it before the Council had determined it, and therefore the cause of his Faith herein, was not the authority of the Council. And if that Council of *Nice* was to be believed for it selfe, without respect to the matter, as depending upon Scripture, why not the Council of *Ariminum* to the contrary; and therefore Saint

*Austin*

S. *Austin* would refer it to Scripture betwixt him & *Maximinus* a Bishop of the *Arrians*, since the Councils was contrary. And if any exception could have been made against the Council of *Ariminum*, as towards the denial of such authority of it as is due to other Councils, had it not been easie for the Father to have held the Doctrine upon the Authority of the Council of *Nice*, though the other had been rejected?

In your 23. Number, you do not fairly render my Answer. I did not say that Christ would not be at all with his Church to the end of the world: but it is not necessarily there meant, that he would be with them unto the end of the world, as he was with the Apostles by Infallible assistance, so he did not promise he would be with the Successours of the Apostles. And therefore if this be a simple mistake, it is a fallacy a *dicto secundum quid*: if you intended a slander, it is worse. Infallible assistance is not there promised, and therefore the promise may be made good without it. Neither was there such need of Infallible assistance (whatsoever you say) because the rule of Faith and Manners was to be determined in the Scripture, which is the Infallible Word of God. So that although they who followed the Apostles in the governance of the Church, had been so disposed for Infallible assistance, as the Apostles, yet had there not been that use of the assistance Infallible; but having not that disposition thereunto, they wanted a condition and qualification for such assistance. And God did not give an Infallible assistance to the Apostles, because they were disposed for that gift of Infallibility, but rather gave them that disposition, that so they might be fitted for that Infallibility. And so if he had intended such a measure of the Spirit to the Successors of the Apostles, as to them, he could have made them as capable thereof.

As for your Reason which you mention of leaving as secure direction for them (who followed) because the further

ther we go from Christs time, the more we are subject to uncertainty about his Doctrine, therefore there is as much yea far more reason (of this secure direction.) I answer, You do not well consider what you say. For if we be more subject to uncertainties, the further we goe from Christ his time, then cannot you urge the credit of those Traditions now equally to the certainty of them then: supposing that there were any of Faith not written. Secondly, this Reason would be none, if men would be guided by Scripture, which hath now the same certainty as ever. This is a Rule which will with equal infallibility hold at all times; and unto which we are all equally obliged.

Again, you would argue that the Church is secure from damnable errour, because Christ promised to be with it to the end of the world, and he is not with those who live in damnable errour.

But what is this to me? you may conclude thus, and yet not against me, if you speak of damnable errour specificatively: for if you mean it reduplicatively, that all errour is damnable, *ut sic, quatenus error*, it is false. All simple errour is not damnative to the person. And therefore Christ may be with some who live in some errour indeed otherwise with whom is he? For who is there that lives not in some errour, though he knows it not? If you mean then damnable errour distinctively, I grant you all; and yet you have nothing thereby for your cause. For this doth not prove infallibility to your Church. Security from damnable errour (distinctively taken) doth not infer absolute infallibility. The former is promised, as also in that of Saint *John* 14. 16. (which you would reinforce here;) but absolute infallibility is not intended. And this you must have, or else you are utterly lost. For if the Church be not infallible in all that is proposed by it, how shall I be assured of any particular thing which it proposeth? If I be not assured of this particular, how am I bound to believe it? If I be not bound to beleeve it upon its proposal, how is it

the ground of Faith Divine. If it be not the ground of Faith Divine, then you are gone. And besides, those promises in Saint Matthew and Saint John you may know were made as to the Apostles equally, and therefore to their successours equally, and to the Church universal equally; by consequent: and therefore cannot you appropriate it to your Bishop and to your Church.

Saint Austins authority in a passage of his, wherein you say he speaks admirably in his *De utilitate credendi*, cap. 6. you had better have omitted. It strengthens your cause nothing, if you quote it as you should. Fifthly it is misquoted for the chapter, for it is not in the 6. chapter, but in the 16. Secondly you may see in the beginning of the chapter, that the scope of it is to shew how authority may first move to Faith. And Thirdly, this scope may discover your corrupting of his Text; for it is not as you give it, a certain step, but contrary, an uncertain step, *vel ut grade incerto imitentes*; as in the Rhemes Edition, Ann. M. D. xxx. Whereby you may perceive how little reason we have to credit your infallibility. And then Fourthly, part of his authority in that chapter, is by miracles of Christ which he did himself on earth.

The summe of your fourth Number is this, to perswade not onely that the Churches authority is infallible if it judge conformably to Scriptures; for so even the Devil himself is infallible so long as he teacheth conformably to Scriptures: but that the Church shall at no time teach any thing that in any damnable errour shall be against Scripture: So that when we know this is her Doctrine, we are sure that this is conformable to the Scriptures rightly understood. And this you would prove by two Testimonies of Scripture.

We answer distinctly, and First to that you say about the Devil. First, we are not commanded but forbidden to consult with the Devil; but we are injoyned to consult with the Church of God. Secondly, we have cause al-

wayes

wayes to suspect the Devil, because either he doth not give us all the Scriptures unto a particular, or doth pervert it, or doth speak the truth with an intention of deceiving the more: but we have more charity towards the Church, we have more towards the Devil. Thirdly, Yet though we do not believe the Devil in point of Faith, upon his authority; nevertheless I can see not believe the Church in whatsoever it saies to be true upon its authority: neither doth it follow, that the Devil should hereupon be the pillar and ground of Truth, when he said that which is conformable to Scripture, as well as the Church, because the Church doth hold and uphold Truth: so doth not the Devil, but when he useth it, he doth it to destroy it: and again we are moved to think that which is proposed by the Church to be true, so are we not moved by the Devil to conceive it to be true upon his saying so. And therefore if I do believe that, which the Devil saith conformable to Scripture, to be true, and do not believe that every thing which is said by the Church to be conformable to Scripture; I do not make the same account of what is said by one and by the other. For that which is true I do believe because it is so, though the Devil saith it: I do believe it in respect to the matter without any respect to the Author, and that which is not true according to Scripture, I cannot believe though the Church saith it; yet am I moved by the authority of the Church to consider the point more, because it is proposed by them: and what is by them proposed according to Scripture I am moved to believe of, with respect of the Author of the proposal; but cannot be resolved in my Faith of, but by the authority of Scripture. And therefore I cannot believe that whatsoever is said by the Church is agreeable to Scripture, because the Church saith it: for this proposition, for ought as yet proved, is not agreeable to Scripture rightly understood. And if you say that your Church must judge the sense, let it first judge whether it doth not beg the principle.

Neither have your Texts alledged any thing for you. Not that of *Daniel* the 2. chapter, the 44. verse. It respects indeed the Kingdome of Christ in generall, and therefore is not proper to any Church of his *figuration*, for any thing can be framed by the Text. Secondly, The Kingdome of Christ principally respects the Church invisible, which as such is not our guide. Thirdly, it may certainly come to its everlasting reign in Heaven, notwithstanding some errors on earth by the Church visible. Fourthly, whereas you say it shall destroy all Idolatrous kingdomes, you doe very well adde in your Parenthesis [Idolatrous Kingdomes] to save your selves from suspition. But if all Idolatrous Kingdomes, then have you reason to make your infallibilitie more strongly infallible, otherwise you will be included in this distraction.

So also that of *Esay* 59. 21. profits you nothing, some of the former answers may serve, it principally is intended for the Church invisible, which by the Church visible may sufficiently be directed through the means of grace to salvation infallibly, without infallibility of the Church. As the Word of God was certain before it was written, and the Church then was by it directed, because it was then in substance of it though not written (as we have said before, but you compell us to repeat) so by the Word written infallibly, though not infallibly expounded and applied by the Pastours of the Church, shall the Church be brought to Life. For if every evil action doth not destroy the state of salvation, as you will confesse: then surely every simple errour cannot, because it is not voluntary. And this is fully able to answer your Appendix to this Number at the end of your paper. Those Testimonies (if they be rightly cited) yet in those terms affirm no more then that the invisible Church shall not perish, which is true, although the visible Church be under a possibilitie to erre, since every errour is not destructive of salvation.

La

In the 25. Number, you tell me what you have said before, but that you have given me some additional Testimonies in the supplement of the last, which have their answer, without repetition. Onely you me where I think find that Saint *Jerome* did receive all those books which you receive for Canonical; and for those Authours which held the Consubstantiality of the Son, and those several properties of the Holy Trinity, you will give me leave with judicious men to suspect *Eusebius*. Believe your Cardinal herein, *Bellarmin* in his *De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis*, p. 54. 56. where he brings the attestation of Saint *Athanasius* and Saint *Jerome* to the same purpose; and Saint *Jerome* calls him not onely an *Arrian*, but the Prince of the *Arrians* sometimes; sometimes the Ensign-bearer. Yea the 7. Synod, he sayes, and the Apostolical Legats rejected his authority, as being an *Arrian* Heretique as he saies. And as for *Austins* expression, that the relying on the Church's authority is the most true and inviolable Rule of Faith you refer it to your 16. Number, and there referre me to the 13. chapter of the first book *Contra Cresconium*, which I cannot see there. If it should be so directly, yet this must be understood respectively to those cases wherein the Scripture doth not clearly passe the Verdict; in which the authority of the Church, is the best rule we can then have as towards practice. But this in his Opinion doth not absolutely leave us to follow Tradition of the Church in points of Faith, unlesse he contradicts himself, as you shall see at the end. But you are afraid of want of Number to make noise, because you say, I said you had no other Testimony but Saint *Austins*. I did not say that you had none but his, absolutely, but you had none but his that I could see of those you produced. Neither him indeed if you please to tell us what you see.

Therefore we shall look over your reinforcing his, and the main testimony for your cause; in my answer whereunto, I see yet no place for amendments or abatement.

I say

I said, if you consider the whole tenour of the chapter, you may be inclined to think that it came from him in some heat of dispute, and methinks I may think so still. Your men are wont to answer evidences of the Fathers which are against them, when they please, that such passages came from them, not *ex persona sua*, but *ex personâ*, and surely we may have that liberty, when there is such occasion given for us to interpret them, as here; if we consider how he was displeased with himself for a former respect to that Epistle, and also if we take notice of his short returns of discourse in this Epistle; and also if we mark his check and correcting, and taking up himself towards the end of the chapter, with an *absit*. *Sed absit ut ego Evangelio non credam.*

And if this answer doth not weigh with you, then I gave you another, that this might be spoken of himself, not *in sensu composito*, as then, but *in sensu diviso*, as in order to that time when he was a *Manichee* himself. To which purpose I told you, it was familiar to him and other writers of that part of the world to expresse a tense more then past by the imperfect: and the sense is, that when he was a *Manichee* he would not have believed the Gospel, but that the authority of the Church had moved him to it. One place of this usage I found to be in a chapter you quoted in his *De Praedestinatione Sanct. lib. 2. cap. 1. §. 14. Qui igitur ejus est, ut eorum scriptorum apostola, qui priusquam ista haeresis oriretur, non habuerunt necessitatem in hac difficili ad solvendum quaestione versari; quod procul dubio facerent, si respondere talibus cogerentur*; where you have the Imperfect Tense, for the Tense more past; *fuerent* for *fecissent*, and so the other. So in his first Book of *Retract. cap. 21. Profectò non dixissem, si jam tum essem literis Sacris tam eruditus ut recolerem*: where you have *essem* for *fuissem*, and so the other. And also by the way let me observe somewhat from those two places towards the main question, besides the use of them in the way of Criticisme. For

by

by the former you have the reason why the Tradition of the Church in Doctrines received, will not make an end of our differences, since the questions were not then started: and also by the second you may observe, that we cannot swallow all that was said by Saint *Austin* without chewing, since he sayes himself, that had he been so well instructed, he would not have said this and that. And indeed his books of Retractations are books against you; and do conclude wholly, that we are not to take whatsoever the Fathers wrote to be as true as Gospel. Yea, some such books of Retractations all of them might have made, as some think *Origen* did, although they are perished as to us.

But the answers which I gave you to that passage of Saint *Austin* will not content you. Therefore you endevour to shew at large that they will not serve. You say unlesse he will stand to that ground, he must needs seem to say nothing against his Adversary. What ground do you mean? What that he was moved by the Churches Infallible Authority, as you would conclude at every turn. No, supposing him not to speak *in ista Sermonis*, yet what he said against his Adversary was reasonable, without urging the Infallible authority. For the consent of the Church might be considered by him as a condition towards the reception of any doctrine; and yet not to be that which he built his Faith upon, as upon an Infallible ground. You may know the *Causa sine qua non*, is not a cause; although such a thing be not without it, yet is not this the cause thereof. And therefore make what you can of the place, it will not afford you a firm foundation, if his authority could do it. You say that this is his first argument, to shew that his Adversary, by citing Texts out of the Gospel to prove *Manichaus* a true Apostle, could prove nothing against those, who as yet have not believed the Gospel. So you.

Καὶ τί μᾶλλον; and what then? Because the Adversary can

can prove nothing by Scripture to those that deny it, therefore Saint *Austin* must infer, that the authority of the Church is infallible, and he must believe the Gospel upon no other ground. What consequence is this? as if because Saint *Austins* adversary cared not for the judgement of the Church, therefore we must be guilty of that which is called Αμαρτια ἀθεραπευτος, which hath so much wronged the Church, as nothing more. This is λογος ἀσυλλογιστος.

You go on in your Paraphrastical discourse. But because I am not one who have not yet believed the Gospel, and so this answer cannot serve me; notwithstanding I must tell you that I am such an one, that I would not believe the Gospel without the authority of the Catholick Church did move me. So you. Out of which words of your own, you may learn how to understand the sense and tense of the Father in the place: *But because I am not one who have not yet believed the Gospel*; then he had believed the Gospel before, and was not to believe it now, and therefore his words must be referred in the *African* idiotism, unto the time more then imperfect, otherwise what he had believed, he was to believe now, which cannot stand with your Infallibility. And yet you say afterwards, mark if his ground be not so as I told you; because (saith he) I have believed the Gospel it self upon the preaching of the Catholiques; therefore if his Adversary should say, do not believe the Catholicks, he doth not go consequently to force him by the Gospel to any Faith to *Manichaus*. And hereupon you break out in these words, *Can he more clearly ground upon the Infallible Authority of their Teaching, then upon this to believe the Gospel it self?*

*Answ.* Again these words do not include a Divine Faith of the Infallibility of the Church, which you must have, or else your cause is starved. Because those words, *I would not believe the Gospel, unless the authority of the Catholick Church did move me* which must be the principal ground, do not include his Faith of the Infallibility of the Church.

Church. He might be moved by the authority of the Church, though not resolved in his Faith by the Infallibility pretended, & according to this proportion must all his discourse be understood, which proceeds from his belief of the Gospel by them, to his being perswaded by them to Manichæism, if any thing should be found in the Gospel towards it, or else proceeds to his not believing of *Manichæus*, upon his belief of the Catholicks, who bad him believe the Gospel and not *Manichæus*. These must be the hinges upon which the whole disputation must turn, and therefore if those words be not understood of an ultimate determination of his Faith by the authority of the Church, but of an instrumental moving, nothing will be concluded sufficient and sufficiently for you. But this answer you give not me any return to. Ponder it very well, for its importance in this debate. For if the whole chapter was soberly spoken, and if that he did not speak of himself, as when he was a *Manichæan*, yet if he here intends to signifie no more then onely the authority of the Church was an impulsive to the belief of the Gospel, you will evince no more then what you need not contend for, because we do not contend against it, as being not the state of the question.

Therefore it remains for you to prove your supposition, or your proofs of an Infallible authority of the Church, which indeed you would put in, in your conclusions, but is wanting in the premises. And if it did belong to me to dispute, it were not difficult to shew the contrary. And since they may come in upon account of the reason of my denial, they shall be there two moments from the chapter.

First, Because he saith he did believe the Gospel *per illos*, not *propter*. Now what we do properly believe any one in, we must believe for him, not by him; for him as a cause, not by him as an instrument, and therefore we believe what God sayes to be true, not by him, but for

him. And if the Apostles, as he dyingly went not Matters of their Faith, a Fortiori then were not those Catholicks he speaks of, such, as he ought, for them silver to believe.

Secondly, Because in several places of the chapter, he doth signifie, that if any reason could be given, or any thing whereby it might be manifestly known, that his Adversary were in the right, he would leave his Catholicks. Now this is not spoken consistently to the nature of Faith upon Infallible authority: for what we do believe in way of Faith, we do so believe, as there cannot be a falsity in it, as *Aquinas* doth confesse, and I suppose you too (for you would conclude, no falsity or error can be in any thing, which the Church doth define, because it is infallible) and therefore all the Reason, and all the Science in the world, are not able to shake Faith, whereunto the contrary is insinuated in the Letter: li May, if there be no arguing to the principles of Faith, from other principles, but from the principles of Scripture, there is arguing to Divine conclusions; then assuredly Faith in principles of Theology (as this is one, the verity of the Gospel) is not obnoxious to any decay by any reasons. And it seems his Faith then in the Gospel, was not Divine, upon the consideration of their authority, since Reason may be valid against Humane authority, but not Divine: so that had he meant, he built his Faith of the Gospel, upon the authority infallible of the Church, there had been no place for Reason to have any power of assent on the behalf of the *Manichees*.

Again, if you hold to the Gospel, my hold shall still be to the authority of the Church, upon whose authority I believed the Gospel. I (saith he) *will hold my self to those, by whose teaching I have believed the Gospel, and there commanding me, I will not believe them.* So you think that this is also available for you: surely nothing lesse! for besides that, you omit much of his connexion that makes for

for my former arguments, and after that he engages against your false and blind believing before mentioned, you will find that here he doth not compare the authority of the Church with the authority of Scripture (which is the nick of the controversie) but he doth compare the authority of the Catholicks, as towards the belief of the Gospel, with the authority of the *Manichees*, as to believe their false Gospel of *Manichæus*. Indeed the authority of the Church is more urged, and is more useful to prevail above, or against the authority of private opposites; but whether it hath the moment of infallibility above, or equally to the authority of Scripture in self, in that which is in question, and is not here determined for you.

But you go on. And Saint *Austin* goeth on so far upon this ground as a ground infallible. What of Faith he is again denyed, not simply from the thing it is deeped to be held for by him in this dilemma, if you may have your suppositions, we must needs (how have done.

Well, go on. That he saith, if perhaps you *Manichæus* can find me any clear place in the Gospel to prove the Apostleship of *Manichæus*, that then indeed they shall weaken the authority of the Catholicks. So he saith. And what can you make of this for your use? Take it by it self and it will come to this, that a clear place in the Gospel would perswade him to lessen his opinion of the authority of the Catholicks, when he should hold a clear Scripture above, or against the authority of the Church, then that authority is not in his judgement Infallible: or else Infallible authority of the Church may be opposite to Infallible authority of the Scripture, and one in his opinion of them, (the Scripture) is more Infallible then the other (the Church) which is incongruous, for in Infallibility there is no degree, no more then in Truth. And if you say that the Scripture yet may be more Infallible to him; this spoyls all your cause, for you say you go to Faith by the Church, because that way is more plain & manifest

Therefore you believe me from this passage to shew me what will follow. But what do you think will follow? I pray note it well: their authority being weakned (and shewed once fallible) now neither can I so much as believe the Gospel. And why so? because upon the authority of these Catholicks I had believed the Gospel. So you.

But do you see how you interpose your glosse in your Parenthesis, thus; their authority being once weakned, and shewed once fallible. Do you imagine that we can neglect or overlook this your glossall inference or opposition, and shewed once fallible: as if there were no authority but that which is Infallible, and there were no weakning of authority, but to make it fallible. Authority may stand with Fallibility, for we grant Authority to the Church, distinguishing it from Infallibility. And if you had done so, you had saved many a wound, which your Church hath got by that unfortunate word, *Infallibility*, as one of your own men happily confessed. Neither therefore doth it follow, that the authority of the Catholicks being weakned and shewed once fallible, he could not at all believe the Gospel, because by the authority of the Catholicks, he had believed the Gospel; but he could not then believe the Gospel by that inductive and motive of the authority of the Church: for the first Christians believed the Apostles severally, without the authority of the Church. Yea, if upon that consideration he could not have believed the Gospel, their authority, by whom he did believe it being weakned, yet doth it not from hence flow necessarily, that when he did believe the Gospel, he did believe it upon an Infallible authority; because, although he could not believe the Gospel without it, yet might he account it as towards belief, but a condition, not a cause of his Faith. And this you must have, or else you do not contradict. Whatsoever is necessary to an effect, is not the cause of it; although whatsoever.

ever is a cause thereof is necessary to it.

Therefore that is not so, which again you say that the ground of his beleef in the Gospel was their infallible authoritie; as not only these, but also the next words shew manifestly. When will you by your proof put the infallible proposal of the Church out of question? when shall we have any more then suppolals of it?

Let us see your next words. Wherefore if in the Gospel there be nothing found that is evident to prove the Apostleship of *Manichaus*, then I will beleeve the Catholicks rather then you: but if you shall read me out of the Gospel something that is evident to prove *Manichaus* an Apostle; then neither will I beleeve the Catholicks nor thee. Why so? I will not beleeve the Catholicks, because they (whose Doctrine I thought infallible) have lyed to me concerning the *Manichaans*. But I will not beleeve thee, even when thou citest clear Scripture (for of this case he speaketh) and why so? because thou dost cite me that Scripture to which Scripture I had now beleeved upon their authority who have lyed to me. So you.

And what now from hence can you gather more then from the former passage of the same nature, unless you did make good another Parenthetical supposition, whose Doctrine, I thought infallible? This is not in Saint *Austin*, but comes from your own private Spirit. And therefore if you will not be ruled by our Spirit because of the former exception to the contrary: surely we have no cause to be overperswaded by your judgement without any reason for it.

Secondly, May you not from hence take notice that what I said of Saint *Austin*, that in the Testimony here, he might speak as in some heat of Dispute? For can we think that Saint *Austin* had such a soul as to say soberly and categorically that he would not beleeve clear Scripture which was cited by any one, because Catholicks had told him otherwise? Did Saint *Austin* in your conceit differ in judgement

ment from your *Aquinas*? or did your *Aquinas* differ from Saint *Austin*? Consider then what your *Aquinas* saith in his Summes, the first Part, the first question, and the eight Art. *Innititur enim fides nostra revelationi Apostolis & Prophetis facta qui Canonicos libros scripserunt*; for our faith doth rely upon the revelation made to the Apostles and Prophets who wrote the Canonical Books, but not upon the revelation, if any other was made to other Doctours: Nay, he confirms it by Saint *Austin* out of his 19. Epist. a little after the beginning; *Solis enim Scripturarum libris*, &c. For I have learned to give this honour onely to the Books of Scripture, which are called Canonical, as to believe most firmly, that none of the Authours thereof did erre in writing any thing; but others I so read, that whatsoever holyneſſe or learning they are excellent in, I do not think true therefore because they thought so or wrot so. Compare then this passage with the other, or the other with this; and then judge whether either he did not differ from himself in his Principles, or did not speak the former as a disputant.

Thirdly, Let me note, whereas you do rightly translate Saint *Austin*, as speaking of his beleef by the Catholicks in the tense more then past; you give your self occasion to think that he meant the main passage (*non crederem*) not of himself then, but as before a Manichee. And your argument which you produce a little after against this last answer, because he speaks here of beleeving the *Acts of the Apostles*, and beleeving it by a necessary consequence (because he hath already beleeved the other Canonical books upon the same authority of the Church) doth not overthrow my answer; because you say your self that this book of the *Acts* he did beleeve by consequence; by the authority of the Church he was at first moved to beleeve the other books; and therefore by consequence he did beleeve the book of the *Acts*, because the Catholick authority did in like manner commend both Scriptures. The speaking

ing here in the present doth not derogate from my answer, because the beleeving by consequence, supposeth an act of beleeving antecedent.

Also Fourthly, note that here he said the Catholick authority doth commend, both which may be done without infallibility. For the commendation doth not ingage the judgement in assent necessary: but the authority may ingage the mind to have a good opinion thereof, and so may move dispositively to Faith.

Fifthly, Perpende it well, that it is said by St. *Austin*, that he was moved by the Catholick Church its authority, and that the Catholick authority doth commend both, not the *Roman* authority, which now is included or to be included. And therefore if you could prove that Saint *Austin* intended as much as you would have, and also that his authority were sufficient to carry the cause for the Catholick *Church*; Yet you can have from hence no more then your purpose to prove a particular Catholick Church; if indeed you were such. And therefore have you upon your shoulders such a labour as all discerning Catholicks would detract or retract, namely to make good that whatsoever is said of the Catholick Church, in the respects of it, should be singularly appropriated to the *Roman*. But of this in your 27 number.

Whereas you seem to vaunt upon your paraphrase, could he more clearly say, that if once in one single lye he should find the Churches authority to be fallible, he should then have left unto him no infallible ground at all upon which he were to beleeve Scripture. So you. First I deny your consequence; this doth not follow from what you have urged that Saint *Austin* drives this discourse, that if he should find them in a lye he could have no infallible ground to beleeve Scripture. It follows well that he could not beleeve Scripture by their authority, because they had lied unto him. But though they did not lie to him they might be fallible; for they might purpose that which they thought

to

to be true for errour: and therefore for their not lying can we not infer their infallibility. And for ought I see he doth not here any way give us to understand that he did think they could not lye to him; and therefore he could not conceive them upon this impossibility to be infallible.

As for that which you think an Argument against me, that he could not speak any thing in heat or by slip which he so much inculcates. This is nothing effectual, for how often do we with fervour endevor to maintain that which once hath by incogitance or passion gone from us. Yea, it may seem more likely because he doth so much inculcate it; becaufe we are so eager to cover our imperfections; and especially when we are like to make good use of it against an adversary. Secondly, what doth he inculcate that which you would have? But this is τὸ ἐν ἀρχῇ as they say, this is under question, and therefore his inculcation is nothing to you, if he speak it assertively, until you fortifie your suppositiion.

But one Marginal note of yours more at the sign of the crosse I find, and that is this. Had he said, that he beleeved this or any other Scripture for the Light he received by the reading of it, by which he discovered it to be Canonical, then the *Manichæans* might as easily have said, that by the like Light we clearly discover the Gospel of *Manichæus* to be Canonical. So you.

This is no way moving, much lesse cogent. For first, it proceeds from a Negative; which in the kind of it unless from Scripture (which is the adæquate rule) is of no validity. Becanse he did not say so, therefore he did not hold so? No connexion.

Secondly, by the same reason I may say, he did not hold the authority of the Church to be infallible, for then he would have told them so plainly, he would have made an end of the dispute, without any need of using Scripture.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, they were not prepared for this Theological Argument, because they did not own the Church.

And now all things being duely considered, I think you have no cause to say that I have not sincerely and fully answered what you have had to say for your self out of that supreme Testimonie of Saint *Austin*. And if you compare that chapter with the chapter you mention in the same Number below, namely the fifth, against the Epistle of the *Manichee*, with the 14. *De util. Cred.* against the *Manichees* too; you will not or cannot heartily dislike my Answers, and therefore need I not distinctly to answer this last: since here also he doth not compare the authoritie of the Church with the authoritie of the Scripture, which is our main question; but he compares with the authoritie of those few, those turbulent, those new men, as he speaks, (who were not like to bring forth any thing, which any without doubt might not think not worthy of authoritie) the authoritie of the Church, as to the beleeving of Christ; where also he said that he was moved by the authoritie of the Catholicks; —— *Quorum autoritate commotus Christum aliquid utile præcepisse jam credidi.* Whereby you shall if you will, see the reasonableness of the former criticism; because here he said, *jam credidi*; so that it must refer to to him as a *Manichee*.

And therefore can you not with Saint *Austin* beleeve the whole Scripture to be the Word of God from the beginning to the ending, as upon infallible authority of the Church; because if he did, yet cannot you do it which is not to be done: and if it be to be done, because he did it, then it is not to be done, because he did it not. And I hope those strange stories, and those several points (which you speak to be in Scripture) may be more like to be beleeved upon the authority of the Scripture, then upon the authority of the Church; since the Church hath no authority but from Scripture, not as a Church. And therefore if you have no other infallible ground

for prayers to Saints, and prayer for the dead (in your sense) and other like points, then you have proved he went upon, as towards the believing of Scripture, you have none. Nay, you have not so good authority for those and such like points, as he had for the belief of the Scripture: for besides the difference of the matter, he had Catholick authority for his belief, though the authority was not Infallible: but you have not Catholick authority for your points, though fallible. But I observe your wisdome. You would justifie your points here by Infallibility, which you think may be more likely, then to justifie your Infallibility by your points of difference.

Therefore your conditional postulate might have been spared, untill the condition be proved. If Saint *Austin* had done so as you suppose, then you or your Church would have been more excused from singularity, because you had followed him. As for you, you need not fear singularity. You provide against that in your opinion, or your Masters for you; for you must follow the Church, without examination of what they say. Their word must be taken: but yet your Church may be accused of singularity, because it doth not follow the Catholique. If then you will do prudently (as you speak) go with Saint *Austin* no further, then he would have you follow him, namely in the way of Scripture, which he understood well, and at the latter time of his life: but whether he understood it as much as any the Church had (which you say) may be yet under debate (with all respect to Saint *Austin*) since it appears not that he had any skill in Hebrew, and (if I remember well) confesseth that he learned Greek but late. So then, if in some cases, your own Men confesse that we must have recourse to the Original Languages, how could he understand them so well?

And now come we to your grand assumption, that what hath been said of the Catholick Church (that it is by Christ appointed to be the Judge of all Controversies, and

and that the definition of this Judge is Infallible, and consequently a sufficient ground of Faith) all the Doctrine must be applyed to the Roman Church, and cannot be applyed to the Protestant Church.

And now then you are pleased at the latter end to discover your selfe, that you did intend at first the Roman Church, but dealt more cunningly then the rest of the *Pontificians*, who do include in the nature of the one and true Church, subjection to the Bishop of Rome. Methinks this plot of yours might be somewhat resembled by him who had that Phantasie, that whatsoever Ship came to Port was his, so now every Church must be yours or none; as if the *Roman* Sea were the Ocean: or, you would have all the Honours that might be conferred by God upon that Church, he would please to own signally, and to make his; conceiving that this Church can be none but your own. And thus would you have led me on with some ingenuity, to be liberal in my respects and devoirs to the Catholick Church, that so you might without contradiction sweep all for the Roman Catholick.

But prove that those priviledges, you speak of, belong to the Roman Church, and cannot be applyed to the Protestant Church. You prove it thus:

First, This Protestant Church doth not so much as lay claim to those priviledges, and so by her own Doctrine, she cannot be Judge or Infallible, nor any other Church but the Roman, upon the same reason, because they professe themselves by evident and Infallible Scriptures their own Fallibility, as you prove the consequence to be to the end of your Page of the 27. Number; and therefore the Roman Church is the true Church, unlesse Christ hath no true Chrch, nor hath had these many ages. This is your argument, which proceeds by way of a negative induction, not the Protestant Church, nor this other Church, nor that, nor any other Church doth claim the priviledge of being Infallible Judge, onely the Roman; therefore, otherwise Christ hath had no true Church these many Ages.

Sir, Which will you give us leave to do, to ſmile or weep, that men not to be contemned for their Learning and Reading ſhould be abuſed, and ſhould endevour to abuſe others by ſuch ratioſinations, which are made uſeful onely [illegible].

We and all other Churches do of their own accord yeild unto you that they are Fallible. We ſave you the labour of the eviction. True Churches they ſay they are, and ſay they are not Infallible; and they ſay alſo that you only do lay claim to this Infallibility: but what then? therefore you have Infallibility? what, becauſe you only claim it? Suppoſe that the Roman Church doth lay claim to *Utopia*, or to the *Terra incognita*, no other Church doth, not the Proteſtant, not any other, therefore it is due to them. Yes, but where is this *Utopia*? where is this *Terra incognita*? what be the Priviledges and Dominions thereof? they are yet to ſeek for them, who lay claim to them. Firſt, then make it out that there is ſuch an Infallibility to be had before you challenge it, and do not prove the beeing of it by your challenging it, leſt your Roman Eagle be ſaid to catch at flies: but prove ſolidly the beeing of it by the grounds thereof: and then ſecondly, prove a juſt claim; for ſuppoſe that others did not lay claim to it, what right can yet you have by a claim? Is this alſo given *primo occupanti*? If you have no other tenure for your Infallibility, you have none, and it doth beſpeak fallibility to ſay the title is good.

If I might be ſo bold (and ſurely I may in the cauſe of the truth of God) it is more likely to fall out thus; no Church but the Roman doth pretend to Infalliblity, therefore is it highly preſumptuous, and is onely in this not an Uſurper, becauſe there is no ſuch thing as belonging to any Church. We have no ſuch tradition, nor the Churches of God: and yet alſo is it an inſolent Uſurpation of that Prerogative, which belongs onely to God and Scripture.

This

This is enough to undo your argumentation and you: but whereas you say that all other Churches of other Religions do say indeed that they themselves are the onely true Churches; it is not true, they doe not speak of themselves exclusively, as you do. Particular true Churches, they may be under the truly Catholick Church, and therefore they can confederate one with another, with respective acknowledgements; but you are they who exclude all from the condition of being true Churches, which will not reconcile themselves to you by absolute subjection.

And since you say that all other Churches but yours disclaim Infallibility, you see that we alone do not stand aloof from obedience to your Roman Tyranny. So you are not Catholicks in dominion neither.

Yet you would seem to have some reason for your discourse, that one Church must be Infallible, otherwise Christ hath not, nor hath had, any true Church these many ages. This is inconsequential, unlesse there be some Church Infallible, Christ hath no true Church. It is a false proposition, as we have answered you, from the first to the last, that a true Church is Infallible, and it is now all the question. Though it be not true in every point, yet may it be a true Church. Every error doth not destroy the beeing of the Church, and you have very great cause not to presse this, lest it be retorted against your Church, as it might be to be Even with you; that Church which holds it selfe Infallible, and yet hath erred, is Fallible, and therefore by your Doctrine no true Church, the Church of Rome holdeth it self Infallible, and yet hath erred, then this is no true Church. And might not the assumption here be proved by your own Doctrine: for if the Tradition of the Church be the Rule of Faith, then you have erred in rejecting the Millenary opinion, which was a tradition of the Church.

So then your designe you speak of in the 28. Number,

of not expressing the Roman Church in your dispute, you see is destroyed: for what you say of the Catholick Church, is not sufficiently pleaded for the Roman, and also Infallibility is not yet asserted to the Catholick. And therefore your demonstration you talk of, is but a flourish, and your Argument you think unanswerable, is not to be answered, any more, because that strength which it had is taken away. And I have no more to say untill you have any more to say, upon this point or any you mean, in difference betwixt us.

But yet you have not done, but like a *Parthian* who fights flying; so you dispute still ending. You say you will shew how unanimously the Fathers acknowledge this, Saint *Cyprian* Ep. 3 l. 1. saith, *That false Faith cannot have access to the* Roman *Church*. And when you please to press this, I shall shew you what little ground you are like to get in that Epistle; since though he names the *Roman* Church as the principal Church, as the chair of *Peter*, yet he there defends his own jurisdiction against those who would ramble to *Rome* to have their cause heard and judged there. Neither will you get any credit by those whom he speaks of, and in those words you quote, there is an intimation, that the *Romans* then, when he did write, were not such as those were in the Apostles times, *Apostolo prædicante*; and I shall tell you why it was called the principal Church, for a principle of Unitie; so he, from whence the Sacerdotal Unitie began; and also by reflexion from the Imperial Seat.

And if you will object Saint *Jerome's* authoritie in his Comment upon the first to *Timothy*, that he calleth *Damasus the Pope of* Rome, *the Rectour of the House of God*, which you say Saint *Paul* calleth *the Pillar and Foundation of Truth*. I shall return you answer, that this is not very much; for other Bishops were called in ancient times *Pape* too, and that he calleth him *the Rectour of the House of God*, that is not much neither, since every Bishop is so; The

Rector of the Church in that place where he lives. And this will appear to be less considerable, if you will take notice that in his Comment upon the first Ep. to *Tim.* the third chapter upon these words, *A Bishop must be irreprehensible*; where he speaks of a Bishop in *communi*, he sayes, *Aut Ecclesiæ Princeps non erit*; so a Bishop in general with him is a Prince of the Church, and also you know what opinion he had betwixt Bishops and Presbyters, Read to this purpose his Epistle to *Evagrius*. If you come upon me again with Saint *Ferome* to *Damasus* in an Epistle, you may tell me what Epistle, for he wrote more then one, and his Title in some is, as is set down plainly *Hieronimus Damaso*. Surely Popes then had not that state, or else Saint *Ferom* had little reverence towards him. And you may see also how the Pope writes to him to resolve questions: And is this any sign of the Popes Infallibilitie? Well, but you say in that Epistle you will tell me of, to *Damasus*, he saith, *To your Holyness*, that is, *To the Chair of* Peter *I am joyned in Communion: Upon this Rock I know the Church to be built, he that gathereth not with thee, scattereth*. So you.

And shall I give you answer to this now? then I may tell you that this doth but magnifie the honour of his own Communion, and yet not much neither, if you will observe what he saith in his Comment upon *Amos* the 6. chapter, *Petra Christus est qui donavit Apostolis suis, ut ipsi quoque Petræ vocentur, Tu es* Petrus, *&c.* Then *Peter* is not in his Opinion the onely *Rock*, you see. Moreover, so the Fathers you say, in the Council of *Chalcedon* at the voice of St. *Leo* Pope of *Rome* said, *Peter* hath spoken by the mouth of *Leo*.

And what can you ever make of this that they did say so? No more then thus much, that the Successour of St. *Peter* spoke. Doth this signifie that all the Personal pripriviledges which Saint *Peter* had, Pope *Leo* had? then there needed but him to determin all the Controversies. Yea, according to Saint *Ferom* before, if he had had all those

those priviledges which Saint *Peter* had, yet the Church should not be built upon him onely, for the other Apostles were *Rocks* too. Yea, and is he Christs Successour also? If he be not, then that which you would fain arrogate to him, belongs onely to Christ to be Head of the Universal Church.

To cut short, you remit me to *Bradshaw* and *Bellarmin*, who both shew most diligently how all other Churches have gone to *Rome* to receive judgement in their chief causes. The places you say you will alledge, though for the present you refer me to them.

What do you mean, Sir, to put me off to those adversaries, or in the interim to satisfie me until you have ranged them into another discourse? I need not send you to our men who have withstood those Champions foot to foot ——*Sanctusque Viro Vir.* Saint *Cyprian* in the place before makes an exception against *this Supreme Tribunal for Appeals, and the African Churches.*

After this, you seem to threaten me with further Demonstrations of particulars material to your cause. Untill which time it becomes me in civilitie to wait, and not to take the word out of your mouth, or your work out of your hand. I shall let you rise that you may have more strength for the next assault. I could leave here, but that our late Feast may hint you to think of the contest betwixt the *Roman* and other Churches about the observation of *Easter*. And were those Hereticks or Schismaticks that would not stand to the *Roman* determination herein?

And as for your earnest demand, to know but the name of one of the Pastours Doctors, or Preachers in those last thousand Ages (Years) which preceeded *Luther*; I may conceive my self obliged then to give you some account hereof, when you shall tell me whoever of all the Bishops of *Rome*, in a vast insolency took upon him the Empire of the whole Church, under the Title of *Universal Bishop*, before

*Boniface*

*Boniface* the Third took it from *Phocas* his Donation. Until *Gregorie*'s time inclusively there was no such Usurpation: and you know what *Gregorie* said of *John* of *Constantinople* for his pretending to it, that whosoever did, made himself the forerunner of *Antichrist*.

But if I would answer, the answer would be easie; and it is ready, you have it already in a Testimonie out of *Tertullian* in his Prescriptions; it may be you took no notice of it then, nor did I urge it to this purpose by way of Application to our Church, thus, *That which we are, the Scriptures were from the beginning, nor are of them before it was otherwise, before they were corrupted by you.* Then we are as ancient as may be for our Doctrine and Sacraments, they are found in the Records of Scripture. And if *Campian* says, *All the Fathers were his and yours*; we may say, *the Apostles were ours*. Nay, the Fathers are not yet proved to be yours in the main difference betwixt us; nor I think can you prove them to be yours without corruption of the Text, or of the sense by you in any other point of importance betwixt us. Nay, how many of your *Roman* Communion have given Testimonie to us in Substance of Doctrine, besides *Feuardentius*, whom you have abused (as I told you) therefore counterfeit him after death speak false to Truth and himself? Nay, we are what the *Roman* Church was, before the *Roman* Church was what it should not be, and what it was not in the purest Primitive times: and therefore your additional Doctrines (which, and your universal Jurisdiction pretended, have made the breach, and discontinued our Communion) we could not have from *Rome* then when it had them not. And therefore it is not proper for us to be Opponents, for we are upon the Negative. Doe you shew that a flourishing visibilitie is necessary to the Church, and how it is like to be in your Church in the time of *Antichrist*, according to your Doctrine, and how it held in the time of the *Arrian* persecution. Do you shew that you have had in your Communion

all the Holy men and none other, and then you will do a miracle. And let us hear of it no more until it be done. As he said, *Laudari nec potest nisi peritum.* Go on with your design, and let it be a real defence of your cause, by a solid and substantial maintenance of the points you hold, and we deny, but do not offer to deceive us with old shoes and clouted and mouldie bread, and old raggs and and old bottles, as if you came from a far Countrie, that you might be of a League together, as the *Gibeonites* couzned the *Israelites*. If you do, we shall endevour to discover it. Therefore rather think of that of our Saviour, Saint *Matt.* 9. 16. *No man putteth a piece of new cloth to an old garment: for that which filleth up taketh from the Garment, and the rent, or hole, is made worse.*

And now methinks I should end, but for the conclusion, shewing (as you say) my Replie to your papers to be fully answered in your former discourse.

Sir, this is very odd that you will not answer particularly my premisses, and yet I must combate with your conclusion. And yet if I have answered your premisses, in the Lawes of Disputation, I have nothing to do with your conclusion. And therefore whatsoever part of your discourse you refer me to, in this your conclusion, for my answer to the first Replie, since it is punctually answered by me in the matter of it, needs not to be shewed by me to be insufficient for my answer. For besides that you leave me to find my own condemnation in your paper, where I can, which is a mighty labour and it may be impossible, (whereas you will urge a particular formal Judge to hear and determin,) besides this, you may understand, that that which is not true in it self, (as I have shewed as well as you the contrarie) cannot answer me, for it cannot answer for it self, being false: and therefore the product of it, were it rightly applied in the form, would be null.

Yet have I a fancie, that since somewhat in it is not said before by you, and somewhat you do charge me with, if I

should give no Replie thereunto, you would think that the cause were wanting, or I to it? I shall therefore where there is need briefly run it through.

First you say, that I said there was little reason for me to rejoyn, because in your paper you waive the Application of it to the *Roman* Church. You make your apologie that it was to no end, until I had granted that some Church was the ground of Faith. A man must first prove to a Jew, that the Messias is come, and then he must prove that Christ was this Messias. So you.

I *Answer*, That I think I gave you the true reason of your not including the *Roman* Church in your profecution of the Catholick Church, before. But in that you say, that first a man must prove the Messias to be come before that he proves Christ to be the Messias, you speak not congruously, for Christ and Messias are all one, in different Languages; you mean that Jesus is the Messias. For the Jewes acknowledged Jesus, but not Christ. But let that passe. According to your Doctours you could not abstract the Catholick Church from the *Roman* Church, as I have told you; since they include the Pope as Head, in the definition of the Catholick Church, and that which belongs to the nature of a thing you cannot abstract from it; for then you should make a falsitie in your abstraction, for then you should conceive the nature of it without that which is necessarie to the nature. And that which follows, as you say, by consequent from the Catholick to the *Roman*, is formerly denied.

Secondly, you say that I say that I might still have left you to answer your first paper with your second. And so I say still. You Replie that this is onely to stand to what I have said, as you also do; Let the Reader judge with indifferencie. And I say, let the Reader or the world judge with indifferencie which of us doth most stand to his supposition without reason, or who is most likely to doe so; I, or you, who are so captivated to and by your infal-

libilitie, which you must stand out in by it self, which is the Question: and if you offer to prove it by Scripture, you come upon our ground.

Thirdlie, you say I say you doe not conclude contradictorilie; and I say so still. You Replie, that you alwaies conclude the Churches authoritie to be a sufficient ground ground of Faith, and I say it is an insufficient ground.

*Answer.* But you do not consider that your Arguments or Testimonies doe not conclude the Church a sufficient ground: and therefore whether you as a Disputant doe conclude contradictorilie, let the Reader judge.

Nextlie, you come to my Eight answers, as you divide my last paper. And in my first answer, you say, I spent seven pages to prove the Scripture to be a sufficient ground of Faith. So then I have made by your confession my word good that I would give you a proof by Testimonies, that the Scripture is a sufficient ground of Faith, which I have done with Reasons also thereupon. But you triumph, this this it is not to conclude contradictorilie. And why so? You say, that I should have concluded that the Church cannot be a sufficient ground of Faith; which may be and is true, though it also be most true that the Scripture is a most sufficient ground of Faith, when it is once known by an infallible authoritie to be the Word of God, and also when we evidentlie know that such and such is the undoubted sense of Scripture. Thus you.

But first, are there two sufficient grounds of Faith or not, as to the same Objects? if one be sufficient, why the other? if both be necessarie, then either is not sufficient. So then, if the Scripture be the most sufficient ground of Faith, when it be known to be the Word of God, and the sense of it, then I have contradicted you, and you have contradicted your self.

For I say as you say, that it is most true that the Scripture is the most sufficient ground of Faith. And two sufficients there are not in the same kind. Yes, you say, but first,

first the Scripture must be known by infallible authoritie to be the Word of God. Well, but we both beleeve that the Scripture is the Word of God; and by infallible authoritie we do beleive the Scripture to be the Word of God, because we do believe it by the authoritie of it self, which you say is infallible. And if you believe it by infallible authoritie of the Church, as you think you must go to Scripture for this authoritie: then is not the Church a sufficient ground, because it needs the Scripture to prove the Church, and confirm its authoritie. And therefore my concluding was contradictorie, since your supposition of two sufficient grounds is false. Well, and how shall we know evidentlie whether this is the sense of Scripture? By the authoritie of the Church, you say. And why then do they not by their authoritie evidentlie deliver unto us the sense of Scripture in everie difficultie? If it cannot, it is insufficient; if it will not, it is uncharitable; and besides you fall into the same danger again. For where hath it this authoritie? by the Scripture; then the Scripture is the sufficient ground again, and this not. And when the Church in a Council doth decide a controversie best, it doth so by principles of Scripture, applying them to particular cases, and the determinations of the Church have themselves to the Scripture, but as conclusions; and the Scripture hath it self to those conclusions, as the principle. And therefore properlie the principles are believed, and the conclusions are credible, not by themselves, but by participation from the Principles. So that as the prime Principles are the ground of all Science, so are the Principles of Scripture the ground of all Faith. And the first Principle in *Theologie* must be this, that the Scripture is the Word of God, and so the ground of Faith. And if the Church be not subordinate, it is opposite to Scripture, as the first Principle; and so stands by it self, and must fall to the ground. And if you say it is not necessarie to umpire all doubts, then you say as we say, and why then an infallible Judge?

And

And forasmuch as we doe believe the Scripture to be the Word of God, why do you contend? because we do not believe it as you believe it? but if you intend your Treatise in charitie you might have spared your labour. For we are in a surer condition then you can be upon your Principles: You believe the Scripture by the authoritie of the Church, and we believe it by that by which the Church hath its authoritie. So that the Scripture is not onely the first ground in regard of Order, but also of Causalitie, because the Church hath no ground but by Scripture. Therefore we like your intention better then your judgement. Neither do we denie the moment of the authoritie of the Catholick Church towards Faith, so that we have all the authoritie of Heaven and Earth for our belief. And if there were a doubt, and in us a possibilitie of errour by apprehension that we cannot be assured of the Scripture to be the Word of God by the Church; yet our errour would not be so dangerous, (because we should erre in honour of Scripture) as yours is or would be, who erre in honour of the Church.

Also must I observe your ingenuitie again here that you do profess it as most true, that the Scripture is the most sufficient ground of Faith, when we know by infallible authoritie that it is the Word of God, and that such and such is the sense thereof. If there be degrees of Truth and sufficiencie then are we more secure: if degrees of Truth and sufficiencie to us; then are we yet more right. And also this doth deduct from your universalitie of faith in your first paper by the proposal of the Church in all things.

For my second, third and fourth, and fifth answer, the Paragraphs of your Discourse or Treatise have in them nothing which hath any potential contrarietie to them; which I have not fully, as I think taken away.

In your Application you make to or against my sixth answer, you seem to take another argument to perswade me that the Scripture and the Church may both be grounds

grounds of Faith. It is by way of interrogation. Can I not, say you, ground my Faith upon what Saint *Peter* saith, because I can ground it upon that which Saint *Paul* saith? We answer, your question is out of question, but your consequence from thence is unsolid and unjudicious, because they were both inspired in their Doctrine: but it is yet again in question, whether the Church be infalliblie inspired, and we can be infalliblie assured thereof, the reason being not the same; your reasoning sinks. Yet you insist further. Why is the Scripture the rule of Faith? Because it delivereth to me Gods written VVord, but the Church delivereth to me Gods VVord written and unwritten. I may therefore rule my self by that. So you. I answer, This argument hath no strength to weaken that which I laid down before, that there are not two sufficient grounds of Faith; because the Church is but a Ministerial rule, and subordinate to Scripture, and so subordinately a rule; as to that VVord of God which is written: and therefore can it not ground or order my Faith by its own Vertue, but onely by proportion to Scripture: and so is not a rule equal to Scripture intensively. And if you conceive your argument should have any force, because the Church doth exceed the Scripture extensively, in that it delivereth the VVord written and unwritten; Surely you are much mistaken by your supposition, that there is a VVord of God not written in points of Faith equally credible to that which is written. It is to be proved, not supposed. Your reasoning rather hath force against your self; The Church is not a rule infallible; because it delivereth to us a VVord of God not written, for herein it mainly erres. The Scripture is not onely a necessarie rule, but also sufficient, most sufficient. And therefore they bring in tradition by way of supplement: you say it is a sufficient rule in that you say it is a sufficient ground of Faith, therefore must you expunge tradition.

This

This rule of Scripture you say is often so crookedly applied, that we had need of better securitie of interpretation then our own judgement of discretion. So you.

First, this is accidental to the rule, and therefore it doth not infringe its prerogative.

Secondly, by this Argument, if you drive it to the not being a rule upon this account, the traditions and the testimonies of the Fathers cannot be a rule, because they have been abused.

Thirdly, We do not intend the use of the judgement of discretion to rest in that upon an interpretation; nor do we oppose it to the authoritie of the Church: but we say this must be satisfied in Articles and matters of Faith (notwithstanding the decisions of the Church) by consonance thereof to Scripture, otherwise it cannot give the assent of Divine Faith. Every one must be perswaded in his own mind, although he doth not make his own sense. This private judgement should neither be blind nor heady, it respects authoritie; but joyneth only with appearance of the Word of God.

That which you say to the seventh answer was examined before. That which you say to the eighth answer will not serve to save you from differing from your self, which indeed if it were in way of retractation, would not be reprehensible; as Saint *Austin* speaks in the Preface of his Retractations, *Neque enim nisi imprudens*, &c. for neither will any but an unwise man reprehend me, because I reprehend my errours.

But if you have a mind to see the difference betwixt you and you, you may, thus. Before, you said that the ground of believing is the authoritie of the Church; since you have said, in your second paper, that it is the authoritie of God revealing. If there be no difference, why do you not keep your terms, as a Disputant should do? But you say your reply is exceeding easie; the ground of our faith is God revealing, and God revealing by his Church,

as

as he first causeth our first belief, when he tells us by his Church such and such books are infallibly his word. So you.

Now then, if you make the authoritie of God revealing to be the ground and cause of faith, then it is not the authoritie of the Church, because although God doth reveal by his Church, yet is not the authoritie of the Church the ground of faith, but Gods authoritie; for the Church is but as a Messenger or Ambassadour, which we do not believe for himself, but for his Letters of Credence from his Master: and so is it the authoritie of Gods revealing, which is the ground of faith. And this is made out by that you say, to compound your variance. You say, the ground of our faith is God revealing, and Gods revealing by his Church, as he first causeth our first belief, when he tells us by his Church such and such books are infallibly his word: then the authoritie is his, whereby we believe, and not the authoritie of the Church, which is but Ministerial. And by your own argument are you undone; for if the Church be the ground of faith and not the Scripture, because by the Church we believe such and such books to be Canonical (as you have said before, and also here below in this Reply to my eight Answer) then also the Authoritie of the Church is not the ground of faith, because we must first believe Gods authoritie revealing it to his Church, before we believe the Church. But also, to take notice of that Argument of yours here, it is false. For we must first believe the authoritie of Scripture, before we can believe any authoritie of the Church. For the Church as such, hath all from Scripture, as I have shewed. And therefore by your own argument are you undone again: for if that be the ground of faith, which is first, then the Scripture, not the Church: and therefore the Church may be disputed; not the Scripture, which we do understand by way of Intelligence through a supernatural light;

and cannot demonstrate, as we may, the Church by principles of Scripture.

Again, you seem to differ from your self, because now you hold that the Church is the ground of our faith in all particulars, causally, because by it we believe the Scripture: but before, the faith of a Catholick (which you mean generally) must consist in submitting his understanding, and adhering to the Church, and in believing every thing, because she proposeth it; so your first paper *in terminis terminantibus*. But now when we believe the Scripture by the Church, we may believe that which is plain in it by it self, because it saith it, not because the Church saith it. Do not you now somewhat yield, not to me, but to truth? Truth will be too hard for any one that hath not committed the sin against the Holy Ghost: and yet also will it be too hard for him, though he denies it. Consider then what you have said, and what you think; and judge how the Masters of your Church will answer it at Gods Tribunal for that everlasting cheating of simple souls with the mysterie of implicite faith.

And that also which you so much repeat, that we must receive Canonical books by the Infallible authoritie of the Church, is not yet grown beyond the height of a postulate. It hath been often denied you upon necessitie; and it did not obtain, it seems, universally in the practice of the Church, or else some of your *Apocriphal* books were not accounted Canonical; for *Cyrill* of *Jerusalem* in his fourth *Catechese*, where he speaks in part of the Scriptures, he accounts not in the number the *Maccabees* you spoke of, nor some others.

Yea, for the reception of books Canonical, Saint *Jerome*, gives another reason of embracing but four Gospels, (in his Preface upon the Comment upon Saint *Matthew*) not because the Church owned no more, as you would have Saint *Austin* to be understood: but he doth prove

that

that there are but four, by compare of that of *Ezekiel* with that of the *Apocalypse*, about the foure beasts, which doe represent, as he interprets their meaning, the four Evangelists.

You go on, and say, God revealing is alwayes the formall Object of faith. Before every thing was to be believed as proposed by the Church, because she proposeth it: so that the formal Object of things to be believed, was as proposed by the Church, under that consideration. But sometimes God revealeth his mind by Scripture, sometimes by the Church, as he did two thousand years and more before the Scriptures were written. So you. Well then, now he reveales himself by Scripture contradistinctly to the Church, as well as by the Church contradistinctly to Scripture, which you put in one behalf of your unwritten word. So then, we may believe him immediately by Scripture: but whether we can believe him immediately by tradition without Scripture, wants conviction.

Neither doe you exhibit a reason of this Opinion by that which follows, that for two thousand years and upwards before the Scriptures were written, he revealed himself by the Church. This as before is not enough to sustain traditional Doctrine, because the Scripture in the substance of it, was before it was written: but you cannot evince that the word not written is as certain to us, as the word before it was written was unto them. And the Reason may be taken from Gods wise Dispensations to his Church, then when there was no Word written, he would provide, that that whereby the Church should be ruled, should be extraordinarily conveyed and preserved: but now, when there is a Word written, which is a most sufficient ground of Faith, (as you confesse) there is no such cause of any word beside it. If the Scripture be a Rule of faith, as you do liberally grant, then this is now a rule

not onely inclusively, but exclusively: for otherwise it is not as large as that which is to be ruled; and then they will not agree in the nature of Relatives; and so it will not be a Rule of faith and manners. For indeed the propertie of a Rule doth not only exclude lesse, but also more. It speaks against adding to it as a Rule of faith and manners necessarie in themselves, as well as against the negative of not ordering them by it. But then again, your former reasoning is inconcludent; because God revealed himself to his Church severally, before he revealed himself by his Church. And therefore this was not the way universally holding, namely by the Church, even before the Scripture was written. And therefore much lesse doth it now bind when the Word of God is written. Shew the like inspirations to the Church, as the Prophets had, by some infallible way, and then we shall say, that thus saith the Lord absolutely, undisputedly, without possibilitie of contradiction, by the mouth of the Church in whatsoever it pleaseth to assert for the truth of God, to be believed equally to Scripture; and then a Council is to be believed without Scripture, as the *Nicene*, you mean, was not believed or to be believed without; for it did determine by it, and by that Text I named, [*I and my Father are one*;] which Saint *Athanasius* doth apply to that question foure times in that Epistle you named. And if you can prove that Saint *Peters* successours (as you imagine) had that transient gift of immediate Revelation as Saint *Peter* had, then ye might say, *Peter* spake by the mouth of *Leo*, as infallibly as God spake by his. Then the *Arrians* had as good a plea for their opinion, as *Athanasius* had; for they urged the Council of *Ariminum* and more Councils, as *Athanasius* mentions in the same Epistle: if what is said by the Church must be true, then *Athanasius* must have changed his Opinion. Or if you will have alwayes the Pope to be put into the authoritie of the Church for an infallible

fallible definition binding the consciences of all Christians to believe it as Gospel, then must we believe that what he defines is Infallibly true. What because he cannot erre? No more then those fourtie Popes which *Bellarmin* speaks of in his fourth Book *De Rom. Pontif.* from the 8 chapter, to the 15. who have been, as he said accused of errour; and some whereof none can say that all the distinctions and provisions which have been devised for this purpose, can possibly justifie.

Pope *Zephyrine*, a Montanist, then he erred; if not a Montanist, then *Tertullian* is not to be believed. *Liberius* as before an *Arrian*; so *Athanasius*, so *Jerome*, so *Damasus* of him; and *Damasus* could not erre as you hold, yet an *Arrian* is surely in errour: is he not? *Honorius* was erroneous too; and he spoken of in a former paper, he a *Monothelite*, as *Melchior Canus* saith some Catholicks hold; and he proves it by Synods, the sixth, the seventh, the eighth, and he proves it by Epistles of Popes; if all there be deceived, how shall we believe authoritie of man? As for *Gregory* the Third, *Bellarmin* in the 12. chapter of that book doth openly say, *Vel certe Pontificem ex ignorantia lapsum esse, quod posse Pontificibus accidere non negamus.* So he. Then do you reconcile errour by ignorance with Infallibility. How is he like to be Infallible in all his definitions, when he was ignorant in the Gospel, and therefore gave a Dispensation to a man to take another wife, if the former had a disease that made her not able for the conjugal debt? And *Alphonsus de Castro* in his 1. book 4. chapter, hath this passage, *Omnis enim Homo errare potest in fide etiam si Papa sit. Nam de Liberio à Papa constat fuisse Arrianum. Et Anastasium Papam fuvisse Nestorianis, qui Historias legerit non dubitat*; and a little after, *Nam cum constet plures eorum adeo illiteratos esse ut Grammaticam penitus ignorent, qui fit ut sacras Literas interpretari possent.* And how then shall we by your Head of the Church, or any other

other severally or together know the undoubted sense of Scripture infallibly. But many necessary places of Scripture, do not, (as you imagin) need a Judge, or not infallible.

All things also necessary to be believed, are set down in Scripture, and the contrary you have not shewed, and therefore is there no need of an infallible Judge for the former, or tradition for the latter, as I have shewed. Nevertheless, you proceed thus; The Revelation of God coming to us in all these cases by the Church, you by your own words in this place must grant her authoritie to be our ordinary cause of Faith. So you.

*Answer.* As you suppose much for your advantage, without colour of reason, so you confound much without distinction. First, the term *Revelation* hath two respects, one to the Agent, and so it refers to the act and manner thereof, another to the matter of that which is revealed, that is the object. The Revelation of God taking it passively, for the object, the matter which is revealed, comes to us by the Church, because the Word written ordinarily comes to us by the Church: But taking Revelation of God actively, with respect to the manner, to bear your sense, that God doth reveal himself infallibly by the Church, either in the case of Canonical books or of doubts about the sense of Scripture; so it doth not come by the Church; and therefore is it not the ordinary cause of Faith, which must rely upon infallible veritie, as *Aquinas* speaks in his first part, first question, eight answer, and therefore as before, doth rely upon the Revelation made to the Apostles and Prophets, which wrote the Canonical books, and not then upon the Church, who was bound to receive these Books, and to communicate them. So that the Church is concluded to be as an instrument only, or a motive of this faith, an instrument by its office, and a motive by its authority.

And

And as for declaring undoubtedly the sense of Scripture; So is there not any necessity of a Judge infallible, which you would have the Church to be. Secondly, you suppose that which is not to be supposed, that by my words, since in those cases the revelation of God comes to us by the Church, I must grant her authority to be the ordinary cause of faith: and you say also that by my words in this place I must grant so. Surely you here do commit *Crimen falsi*, for I do not see upon the place any half Syllables out of which you may draw any such interpretative Confession. I have often upon your occasion, said the contrary, that the authority of the Church cannot be the cause of faith. And therefore whether you have any faith of the Articles of Religion, or of Scripture, in all your Church, is more easie to be found then said. And assuredly though we talk of faith in the world, the greatest part of it is but opinion, which takes religion upon the credit of man and not of Scripture. And as for us, we have also the authority of the Church Catholick to move our judgement; and Scripture to settle our faith. And we are more related to the foure General Councils in consanguinitie of Doctrine, as he said, then your Church now.

And now at the end of all, you doe fairly rebate the edge of your censure of my Expression, namely, Excesse of Faith.

But you say, my distinction doth no way salve the improprietie of my Speech. For there is still a difference in more believing Objects, and believing more Objects. But granting that it may be improperly spoken, yet even in that sense it is not truely said, because there can be no Excesse of Faith, in believing that which God hath said.

So then by my Distinctions which is your School of *Fides Subjectiva, & fides Objectiva; fides Qua, & fides Quæ*; there

there may be an Excesse of Faith, in the Object, if we believe more then God hath said; supposing we can believe what God hath not said; although there be not an excesse of faith in the Subject, for we cannot have too much faith in that which is to be believed. But the quarrel against the speech was not because it was not proper enough and congruous in this Discourse, but because of the Application of it to you, as it now appears; and therefore here would you vindicate the Church in this upon the same ground of infallibilitie; *and therefore for your Faith in whatsoever you believe, you have this Warrant, Thus saith the Lord.* But since, this infallibilitie of yours you cannot have without begging of the question even to the last, nor shall have it surely by begging, you are yet to finde out some Expedience of Means or Arguments how to preserve your selves from that just charge of Excesse of Faith: and the chief of that kind is that you speak of your infallibilitie; for which you have not, *Thus saith the Lord.* How then do you prove it? by Tradition? And how do you prove Tradition, by the infallibility of the Church? Therefore go not to Faith about by a circumference. If you have a desire to rest your judgement, and your soul in certain infallibilitie, by your own word; then center in Scripture, from which all Lines of Truth are drawn, and dismisse Tradition (as your men state it) for which this infallibilitie was devised; and yet cannot be maintained; for it cannot maintain it self.

You close with a passage of Saint *Austin*. If so the words, you intend it to set out your Charity to the Church of Christ, not to perswade my Faith in its infallibilitie. I may love the Church without infallibility, because though I doe not love Errour, yet must I love the Church when it is in Errour. And this gives you occasion to think well of this respective and full answer to your last Paper. Excuse

me

me that it was so long ere it came (and yet not much above the space of yours) and also so long now it is come.

Onely let me leave you with a Father or two, in whose company you are delighted; *Tertullian* in his Prescript, *cap.* 8. *We have no need of Curiositie after Christ, nor further Inquisition after the Gospell. When we believe we desire to believe nothing beyond. For this we first believe that there is not any thing beyond which we ought to believe.* Again against *Hermog. cap.* 22. *I adore the plenitude of Scripture.* And a little after, *Scriptum esse doceat Hermogenis Officina; If it be not written, let him fear that woe appointed for those who adde or take away.*

And Saint *Austin*, in his 2. book *De Doc. Christiana cap.* 9. *In iis enim quæ aperte in Scriptura posita sunt*: Amongst those things which are plainly laid down in Scripture, are found all those things which contain Faith and Manners of Living; to wit, *Hope and Charitie.*

For the excellent modification of Scripture, in the 6. chapter, *Magnifice igitur & salubriter Sp. Sanctus ita Scripturas Sanitas modificavit, ut locis apertioribus fami occurreret, obscurioribus autem fastidia detergeret. Nihil enim fere de illis obscuritatibus eruitur, quod non planissime dictum alibi reperiatur.* And the same in the 7. chapter, for the second Degree or step to Wisedome, He saith, *Deinde opus est mitescere Pietate, neque Contradicere Divinæ Scripturæ, sive intellectæ si aliqua vitia nostra percutit; sive non intellectæ, quasi nos melius sapere meliusque percipere possimus: sed cogitare potius & credere id esse melius & verius quod ibi scriptum est, etiamsi lateat, quam id quod nos per nos met-ipsos sapere possumus.*

And again, Saint *Austin contra Literas, Petit.* Lib. 3.

cap. 6. *Proinde sive de Christo, sive de ejus Ecclesia, sive de quacunque alia re, quæ pertinet ad fidem vitamque nostram, non dicam nos, nequaquam comparandi ei qui dixit, Licet si nos, sed omnino quod secutus adjecit, Si Angelus de Cælo vobis annuntiaverit præterquam quod in Scripturis legalibus & Evangelicis accepistis, Anathema sit.*

Consider what is said, and the Lord give you understanding in all things.

To

# To the Reader.

*How in these times in which there be so many Religions, the true Religion may certainly be found out.*

1. A Satisfactory Answer to this Title will alone put an end to the endless controversies of these dayes. This made me think my labour well bestowed in treating this point somewhat largely. And because that Treatise hath received a very large answer, the examining of this answer will make the Truth yet more apparent. That this may be done more clearly, I will briefly tell you the Order I intend to observe in the examination of the said answer. And because this answer directly followeth the same Order which I observed in treating the question prefixed in my Title; Therefore when I have shewed you the Order of that Treatise, you will clearly see that I shall most orderly answer the Reply against it.

2. That Treatise had a short Preface to tell the intent of it. My first Chapter must then be the Examination of what is said against this Preface. Again, that Treatise did shew five things.

First, it did shew the necessity of a Judge, to whom all are bound to submit.

Secondly, That Scripture alone did not suffice to de-

cide all neceſſary Controverſies without a living Judge (to the 17. Numb.)

Thirdly, that this Judge could be no other then the true Church (to the 21. Numb.)

Fourthly, that the true Church is infallible in her judging points of Faith, (to the 17. Numb.)

Fifthly, That this true Church which is our infallible Judge, is the Roman Church, (to 29 and laſt Numb.)

Laſtly, followed the Concluſion. My anſwer therefore muſt have five more chapters to ſhew the Reply made againſt that Treatiſe to be unſatisfactory in every particular argument oppoſed againſt me in all theſe five points.

3. There might have been added another chapter to examine what my adverſary ſaith concerning the Concluſion of my Treatiſe. But as he himſelf (Page 112.) obſerveth very well, he might have ſpared his Reply againſt my Concluſion, becauſe it containeth no new thing appertaining to the main Controverſie, but it was made onely to ſhew that in the handling of the main Controverſie, I had anſwered all his paper, which I did there run over in order. And therefore in his anſwers to all I had ſaid about the main Controverſie, he had given up his anſwers to all that which is onely run over again in the concluſion. Neither know I any reaſon that I gave him to fanſie (as he ſaith he doth) that I ſhould either think a good cauſe wanting to him, or him wanting to a good cauſe, unleſſe he had anſwered my Concluſion apart, though ſomething were in it not ſaid before by me and ſome few things in which I charge him. But Sir, that which I ſtand upon is the main queſtion and the proof or diſproof of it. Nor will I judge ſo hardly of you as to think you will conceive either my cauſe worſe, or me a worſe defender of it, becauſe I tire not my ſelf and my Reader with our perſonal debates, when they concern not the main queſtion, in which both of us have been ſo large. And ſo as you thought you might have ended when you came to that

concluſion

conclusion, so I think I may well end when I have answered those hundred Pages, and more, which I met with before I come thither, though there still remained something which concerned our private debates. For if that which hath been said before doth not satisfie, no great satisfaction will be added by going on a little further in the same strain in matters lesse to the matter.

# The first CHAPTER.

## *The Answer to my Preface Confuted.*

1. YOur first words intimate that you fear least your silence should make me seem to my self or others to have got the Victory. Sir, your Reply is most welcome in this respect that it doth more help me then your silence could, not to seem to have got, but really to get that Victory which I desire not to my selfe, but to truth. For the examination of your Reply will serve for a Touch-stone to my Arguments. I will follow you as you desire step after step, and *στοιχηδόν*.

2. To shew the necessity of treating the matter I had undertaken, I said that such a manner of reading the Scripture as is permitted by you to all sorts of people, with so unlimited a Licence, to interpret them according to their own private judgement of discretion, as a thing most apt to cause a numberlesse number of Sects and Heresies. A *priori* this is proved thus. You permit any Artificer, who can read, to take the Bible into his hand, and to take it for his sole, and onely Iudge of all necessary Controversies. And though all the force and efficacy of the words of Scripture consist in the true sence and sincere Interpretation

tation of it, yet when all comes to all you leave this Interpretation to be made by every Reader, though never so unskilful with so great Latitude, that though a General Council of the greatest Doctors which could be gathered together, should have defined such and such a point for undoubted true Doctrine, and to be held so according to Scripture, yet you permit any Cobler to make a Review of this Decree, and if he hearing all that can be said on the one side and on the other, judgeth at last that the whole Councel hath erred in interpreting Scripture, you leave him free to hold himself so strongly to his own interpretation, as if it were the true sence of Gods Word; neither will you hear of any Obligation which he hath interiorly to submit his judgement (which is the seat of true faith or errour) to any other Judge upon earth. For surely if he be left by your Principles so free in the choice of his interpretation of Scripture, as not to be obliged to submit interiorly to a whole General Council, he hath far greater freedom in not being obliged to submit to any other private Doctours. Is not this to leave men in a mighty hazard of misunderstanding Gods Word, and falling into Heresie?

Secondly, the same is proved a *posteriori* in those places where the sacred Scriptures are thus prostituted not only to the bare reading, but also to the interpretation of every prosane and ignorant fellow (I still mean when he shall have heard or seen what can be alledged on all sides) there and onely there, Sects have multiplied, and do multiply beyond measure.

3. Neither do any of your arguments prove this not to be the true cause of Heresies, and bad life which followeth Heresie. First it is so far from being contrary to that Text, *You erre not knowing the Scripture*, that it is most agreeable to it. For a most fit way to erre against the knowledge of Scripture, is to permit such, and a great number of such men to interpret Scriptures, as are most

fit

fit to serve in the interpretation of them especially being licensed to cross all Antiquity, and all the Authority of the Church if these stand in their way. And I wonder why you call this your manner of proceeding, *The knowledge of Scripture.* If the works of these famous Physitians *Galen* and *Hipocrates*, were thrust into all Trades-mens hands, and every one of them were licensed to interpret, as they sincerely thought best, would you call this *The knowledge of Physick*, especially if every one might be permitted to hold his interpretation against a General Assembly of most learned Physitians? Secondly, you in vain object that of Saint *Paul*, *That the Scriptures are able to make us wise unto salvation.* Far was it from the intention of Saint *Paul*, to speak of the Scriptures interpreted by every giddy fansie, for thus they may be the occasion of our damnation. Saint *Paul* said they were able to make *Timothie wise to salvation*, because he was a man *who did continue in the things which he learned and had been assured of* (to wit, by the Oral tradition of the Doctours of the Church) *it may knowing of whom he had learned these things*, and these traditions. Let such men read Scriptures, and let them with such interpretations understand them, and they will make *them wise to salvation*, and *to continue still assured of the Doctrine of the Church, and never to contradict that.* Thirdly, you say, *I confesse that when we are by the Church assured that the Scripture is the Word of God we may ground our faith in it for those things which are plainly delivered.* Yes, but I also say, that all things necessary to salvation are not plainly delivered in Scripture. And Saint *Peter* saith, *That many to their perdition did misunderstand some hard places of Saint* Paul. So that misinterpretation of hard places may be the cause of *perdition.* Fourthly you object Heresie and lewd life to some in whom you say we invested infallibity. If I should grant all, what prove you from hence, but that there be other wayes to Heresie, and bad life, besides giving all scope to interpret the Scriptures as we judge fit;

so

So there be other wayes to Hell besides Drunkennesse, but what doth this hinder drunkennesse from being the high way to Hell? Again, had not *David*, who was a murderer and adulterer; had not *Salomon*, who was an Idolater, the infallible assistance of the Holy Ghost in writing several parts of the Holy Scripture? But to prevent this, and all that else where you doe, or can say against the Pope, I (in my 21. Number) desired you, and all to take notice of that which here you quite forget. I said, *I would have every one to know that the Roman Church doth oblige to no more, then to believe that the Pope defining with a lawfull Council cannot erre.* How then doth the belief or faith of our Church (I speak not of private mens private opinions) invest infallibility in a person heretical or lewd? Those Doctors who are of that opinion that the Pope can not erre in defining out of a general Council, have other Answers to your Objection. But that which you say is nothing against our faith, which no man (though never so little a *Frenchman*) will say obligeth us to hold the Pope infallible in defining, out of a general Council. So much for this.

Whereas I said that we cannot have, as things stand, any other assurance to ground our faith upon then the Church, you tell me, I suppose the question. Sir, I did not suppose, but onely propose, what presently I meant to prove. And where as you say, that I do not well consider what I say, when I say, *that as things stand we have no other assurance.* I answer, That though God might have ordained otherwise, yet as things stand the Church is the ground of our faith in all points, speaking of the last ground on which we must stand, not a Humane, but a Divine ground, *The pillar and ground of Truth*; and it is the *first*, because by it we believe the Scripture to be the Word of God as I shall shew, Numb. 20. chapter, 3. Neither doe we first believe the Church for the Scripture as I shall shew, chapter 3. Numb. 31. 32. though against those who have first admitted

the

the Scriptures for Gods Word, we do prove by the Scriptures the authority of the Church. That I have said nothing against the practice of our Church, appeareth by what I said just now, shewing how the people deprave the hard places of Scripture to their own perdition.

5. You charge me with abating from my first Proposition in which I said, Divine Faith in all things was caused by the proposal of the Church, because now I say that when by the infallible authoritie of the Church we are assured that the Scripture is the Word of God, we may believe such things as are clearly contained in Scripture. Good Sir, Do you not see, that if I be asked why I believe (in this case) such a thing, my first answer will be because God hath said it in the Scripture? but if I be pressed further; and why do you believe the Scripture to be Gods undoubted Word? my last answer must be for the infallible authoritie of the Church by which God teacheth this Verity. Surely the main question that serveth for the knowledge of the ground work of all our faith, is to examin upon what authoritie at last all our faith doth rely, when all comes to all. Take then the belief of what particular points you please, and examine upon what authority it cometh at last to rely, and you shall ever find it to be the authoritie of God revealing by the Church.

6. Now whether my adversary be indeed, as he saith, one of the most slender Sons of the Church of *England*, or whether he hath shewed that Treatise of mine to be no Demonstration; Let the indifferent Reader, after due pondering the force of all Arguments determin. Sure I am that this is no Demonstration which you adde; *The Scripture is infallible, but the Church is not, therefore I must take for the ground of my Faith the Scripture.* For first, The Scripture cannot be proved to be Gods Word without the Church be infallible, as I shall shew, chap. 3. Numb. 20. Hence followeth secondly that the Church must have infallibilitie sufficient to support this most weightie

Article of our faith, *That all the Scripture is the Word of God*, and therefore though upon her authority I believe Scripture to be most infallible, yet because I ground this belief on her authoritie, her authoritie is the last ground of Faith.

7. And whereas in your next Number, you promise such souls as have forsaken an infallible Church, a happy eternitie upon this ground, that *those things which are necessary to salvation are plain in Scripture*, I pray God their souls come not to be required at your hands. For this ground is most groundless in two respects. First, because no soul can have infallible assurance of the Scriptures being the true Word of God, if the Church be not infallible, and you refusing to stand on this ground make the last ground of all your faith to be I know not what kind of Light, Visible to certain eyes, such as yours are, discovering unto them infallibly, that such and such books be the infallible Word of God. The vanity of which Opinion I shall shew chap. 1. Numb. 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27. Secondly, It is most manifestly false, *That all things necessary to salvation are plainly set down in Scripture*, as I shew chapter 3.

8. In your next Paragraph, I find nothing which I have not here answered, onely you still force me to say, *I would have every one to know that the Roman Church doth oblige to no more then to believe, that the Pope defining with a lawfull Councel cannot erre.* What proceeds from this authority we profess to proceed from the authoritie of the Church. When the Church diffused admitteth these definitions her consent is yet more apparent.

9. As for your complaint that your paper is not fully answered, I suppose that if any thing of importance was left unanswered you will tell me of it here, that I may here answer it. Concerning my manner in answering of you, I must tell you that St. *Thomas*, and the chief School Divines, for clarity and brevity, use to proceed thus. Having first proposed the question they put down the reasons which

which seem to make against the truth. This was done to my hand in your first paper. Then they set down the Truth and the Reasons of it, and this Saint *Thomas* in his *Quæstionibus fusiùs disputatis* doth sometimes very largely; (and this I did to your hand in my last paper.) Lastly, they solve the former Objections against truth, by reference to such Reasons as they (in their Proofs) did shew the truth to be grounded upon. And this in my conclusion I shewed my self to have performed; or, if any little thing were wanting I did supply it; Wherefore, though I had not your consent to proceed thus with your paper, yet do content my self with having the consent of the best Schoolmen. My intention in rejoyning by a Treatise was to have this most important matter distinctly, orderly, and fully put down. And by having done so I find this great commodities, that your answer becomes more Methodical, and my Reply to your Answer more clear and perspicuous. And the Reader seeth still how orderly the combat is.

## The Second Chapter.

### *The necessitie of a Judge in all Controversies to whom all are bound to submit.*

1. IN the beginning of your Answer, to what I said concerning this point, you go about to perswade us, that we Recusants (who upon this account are liable to loose two parts of our Estates, and what else you are, or shall be pleased to take from us, be it goods, liberty or life) that we I say are most likely to take up our Religion by prejudice. Doubtless you must think us first to be very noble contemners

Of my first Number.

tenners of the world, whoſe greateſt commodities do not hinder us, from looking upon even with prejudice, a Religion ſo manifeſtly prejudicial to us; and ſo your own *Tertullians* ſaying fitly checks you, for being one who cannot ſee ſo manifeſt Verities as be in our Religion, you perſwade your ſelf to ſee certain Falſities, which ſo manifeſtly be not in it, let us come to the matter.

Of my ſecond Number.

2. God having made man to a ſupernatural end to be attained by ſupernatural means, (among which the firſt is true faith) it is clear that he muſt according to his merciful Providence, provide us ſome way to this faith, ſo eaſie, that all (if they pleaſed) might be brought to the knowledge of it. And becauſe the far greater part of men were ignorant, it beſeemed his goodneſſe (who is the Lover of Souls) to provide us ſuch a way as theſe ignorant men ſhould not be able (unleſs by wilfully careleſneſs) to erre by it, according to that of the Prophet *Eſay* 35. promiſing at the coming of the Meſſias, *A Path and a way which ſhall be ſo direct to us that fools cannot erre by it.* To elude this Text; You ſay, ſure may we be that the Letter doth reſpect the *Jewiſh Church* after their Redemption from Captivity. I anſwer, if this be ſure, then ſure it is, That God directeth the *Jewiſh Church by a way ſo direct that fools could not erre by it.* And if he did this to the *Jewiſh Church*, there can be no good reaſon why he ſhould be leſs careful to direct the ignorant of the *Church of Chriſt*. Whence you ſee I had no reaſon to have feared this Interpretation, Yet I think it is ſure that this is not the true interpretation, for when did *the blind ſee, deaf hear*, when did then *God himſelf come and ſave us?* And if you will have our Saviour himſelf to be this way, as he ſaid, *I am the Truth and the Way*, this ſelf ſame Saviour ſaid, I (who am this way) *am with you untill the conſummation of the world*, to wit, *directing my Church the right way to ſalvation*, of which direction the Church hath no leſſe need now, then then. And as we could not ſecurely have put a limitation

mitation to theſe words of *Joel*, if Saint *Peter* had not ſecured us of the true ſenſe, ſo cannot you here limit theſe words, not having the like warrant for it. And as for the firſt part of Miracles, it is manifeſt by our Saviour his own words, *Thoſe who believed in him ſhould do greater then he had done.* If then this Text was Verified after our Saviours time, you cannot ſay it is onely ſpoke of his time, and that he did take away *a way* ſo neceſſary for us, *His guifts being without Repentance.* And it is ſtrange that you thinking this guift Litterally conferred to the *Jewiſh Church*, ſhould with the ſame breath plead ſo hard that it is a guift, *which ſhould not in full dimenſion be alwayes extended to the Church.* I cannot believe that you truſt your other argument. *If this way be promiſed to the Church*, Ergo *the Church is not this way.* Suppoſe God had promiſed the Kingdome of *France* a Monarchy, *Ergo* the Kingdome of *France* (ſay you) is not this Monarchy. The true conſequence is, Ergo, *The Kingdome of* France *is this Monarchie. The Church is this way which God promiſed it ſhould be.* And it is ſo by the ſure guidance of him who is the *way*, and is with his *Church* ruling it until the continuation of the world. And ſo Chriſt is *Regula regulans*, and the Church *Regula regulata.* But being ruled by him there is not the leaſt danger that it will ſwerve from the VVord of God, and you may well follow ſuch a Guide with blind obedidience. And ſtill I muſt mind you that I ſpeak of the Univerſal Church repreſented in a General Council confirmed by the Supreme Paſtor. This Church guiding by her infallible doctrine is this way, the Church Diffuſive (guided now by this Doctrine) was promiſed this Direct way: ſuch a way we were promiſed, a way ſo *direct repreſented that fools cannot erre by it.* The Scripture as ſome may conceive (for you dare not defend it) is not this way, for we ſee with our eyes, not onely fools, but alſo moſt learned men to erre groſly, and to follow moſt contradictory opinions, whileſt they profeſſe from their hearts to follow Scripture as neer as they can; the Scripture therefore is not this way,

yet ſuch a way we muſt find to make Gods promiſe good. Nothing then with any probabilitie can be ſaid to be this way, but the Viſible Church of Chriſt. For the Church Inviſible as ſuch, is no way according to your Confeſſion. The viſible Church then is this Judge; by ſubmiſſion to her judgement we in all things are ſecured.

Of my third Number.

3. Whence what you ſay againſt my third Number is eaſily anſwered. For all Religions agreeing that there muſt be one Judge of all Controverſies which either be, or may be in Religion, they muſt all give infallibility to their Judge as you your ſelves do, affirming Gods written Word to have plainly ſet down all things neceſſary to ſalvation, ſo that no neceſſary controverſie can ſpring up but this Judge as you ſay doth decide it, which how falſe it is I ſhall fully ſhew chap. 3. All other Sectaries agreeing with you in this point, I underſtand not how you could ſay, that none but we held a Judge infallible. And indeed without an infallible guide every man might proceed as if your faith were fallible, and ſo give an infallible aſſent to nothing; I did never ſay that without ſuch a judge we ſhould be free to follow (without any fault) our private judgement in holding what we will, as you inſinuate: but I ſaid, *otherwiſe every man might be free to believe what he judged beſt, and ſo we ſhould have as many Religions as there be private and different judgements.* Had you put theſe my words, you had not had a word to ſay. But you thought good to put ſuch words as you knew how to anſwer, and to leave out my true words, and to ſay nothing to the argument by which I proved them. And ſo that argument ſtill ſtanding in force, all that you ſay againſt your own ſaying is from the purpoſe.

4. You adde that you doe not ſay we ſhould follow our own judgement of diſcretion without means of regulating our judgements. But mark how in the next words you take away all means (for to take away all infallible means is to take away all means able to

produce

produce an infallible assent to faith) to have us surely guided in matters of faith, for you say, *yet after we have perused the Definitions of Councils, we cannot resign up our assents to their Dictates upon their account, but do examine (as the Bereans did) which Saint* Paul *said, untill we can find them resolved into the infallible Rule of Holy Scripture*: So you far from the spirit of that great Saint *Gregory*, who said, (L.1.Ep. 24.) *I do professe my self to reverence the first foure Councils as I reverence the four Books of the Gospel. And in like manner I do receive the fifth Council; whosoever is of another mind, let him be an Anathema.* Thus he received all the lawful General Councils, which had been before him, for there were but five. But whereas you will not resign up your assent to the Definitions of Councils, until you first can find them resolved into the infallible Rule of Scripture; I must tell you first, that you will still be strongly pressed, to shew upon what infallible principle you take Scripture by an infallible assent to be the undoubted Word of God, and then you shall see how the whole Machin of your religion topleth & tumbleth to the ground; for there cannot be a more groundles ground, then that ground upon which you (by rejecting the infallible authoritie of the Church) are forced to build your whole religion, to wit, that you by the meer reading of the Scripture can by its Light (as you discover the Sun by its Light) discover it so manifestly to be the undoubted Word of God, that this discovery sufficeth to ground your infallible assent to this veritie. And it must be a far surer discovery then that by which we discover the Sunne by his Light; for this discovery can onely ground a natural certaintie, the other discovery must ground a supernatural, not certainly, but infallibly. Secondly, I must tell you, that these your proceedings to a private review, *after you have perused the Definitions of the Councils to examine them until you find them resolved into the infallible Rule of Scripture*, (of which resolution you make your private judgements the Iudge

See of this chap. 3. Numb. 20.

to

to open a wide gap to Hereſie, as I have ſhewed in the laſt chapter, Numb. 2. And for the importance of the matter I will here again further declare in an example which hereafter alſo will ſtand me in much uſe. Let us take an *Arrian* Cobler; to this man, this your Doctrine giveth the final review of the Council of *Nice*, and you give him leave after he hath peruſed the definitions of this Council, (defining God the Son to be of the ſelf ſame individual ſubſtance with his Father) to examine them, until he find them reſolved into the infallible rule of Scripture. He doth examine them, and chiefly how they agree with that text, *I and my Father are one*, on which Text you * afterwards confeſs the infallibilitie of this definition to be chiefly grounded, and therefore St. *Athanaſius* did preſs it thrice. Now in the examining of the conformity of this definition with this text, the *Arrian* Cobler by his poor underſtanding is eaſily able to ſee (that which a wiſer man would yet ſee ſooner) that he is put upon a neceſſitie to inquire how God the Son, and his *Father are one*, whether it be by affection onely as *Arrians* hold, or *One* in the ſelf ſame individual ſubſtance as the Councel defineth, and inquiring this, he calls to his mind that other text, *Jo.* 17. v. 21. where Chriſt prayeth, *That all his Diſciples may be one thing, as thou Father in me, and I in thee.* Here will this Cobler ſay, (becauſe he hath often been inſtructed by his own Doctors) Chriſt, who ſaid, *I and my Father are one thing*, demandeth that his Diſciples *may be one thing, as he and his Father are one thing.* But he doth not demand that his Diſciples may be *all one thing*, in the ſelf ſame individual ſubſtance; Therefore (he concludes) Chriſt is not one thing in the ſelfe ſame individuall ſubſtance with his Father, but one thing in affection onely as his Diſciples might come *to be one thing.* Falſe therefore (would he ſay) is this definition of the Council which cannot be reſolved into the infallible Word of God, in which all things neceſſary to ſalvation (as this point

* Chap. 4. Number 57.

point is) are plainly set down, as this point is not, for this, is the plainest place, and yet conferring it with the other, I find it not evidently agreeing with the Definition of the Council, but rather evidently against it; by which I conclude in this my Review, the Definition of the Council to be false. Most learned Sir, either convince this Cobler by some clearer Text of Scripture, which I am sure (if this Text fail) is impossible, or else to the eternal good of misled souls, confesse, that if once you give private men leave to make a Review of the Definitions of Councils, you can find no means upon earth to put an end unto our endless controversies; the Scriptures alone not sufficing for this end, as I shall shew in the next chap. without you take the Scriptures as they send us to the Church bidding us hear her, under pain of being accounted Publicans and Heathens.

5. Thirdly, Learned Sir, I must tell you that this your Doctrine maketh the Definition of true Councils, and their final determinations to be indeed no Definitions nor final Determinations at all. For you make all those great Fathers of the Church to assemble themselves, from so remote parts of the world, onely to talk and discourse about such and such points in controversie, and to leave the controversies themselves undefined, and undermined, to be finally defined and determined onely by those places of Scripture; which places as they could not before the meeting of the Councils, so they cannot after the meeting of the Council fully define, determine, and decide these controversies. Now surely it is clear by these Acts of the first four Councils (which Councils your *English Church* holds for lawful) that the Fathers of these Councils never so much as doubted, but that they had all plenitude of power and authority from God to define, and finally to determine those controversies still arising. And they had grievously wronged the world by Excommunicating all such as should gain-say what they had defined and determined, if Errour and Falsity, and Contradiction to Scripture

could have been found in their Definitions and Determinations. What you touch concerning the *Bereans*, I anſwer fully, chap. 3. Numb. 14.

6. Whereas you adde fourthly, *That the deciſions of the Church, though unprovided of infallibilitie, do yet oblige unto peace, though their judgement cannot claim an undiſputed aſſent, yet the power they have from Chriſt doth require an undiſturbance in the difference*; you teach by words, what the deeds of your glorious Reformers have notoriouſly gainſaid. Secondly, ſeeing that a general Council (as you in your firſt paper confeſs) is the higheſt Court on Earth, to hear and determine Controverſies, if her determinations may be erronious, and theſe erronious determinations be to be accepted peaceably, reverently, and without diſturbance; in what a pittiful caſe ſhould Gods whole Church be, which having no higher Court, from which relief might be hoped, is bound to conform and ſubſcribe to erroneous definitions; and all preachers are ſilenced and obliged not to open their mouth againſt theſe errours. Did it beſeem the wiſedome of Chriſt to appoint ſuch a Government in his Church, which ſhould leave open ſo wide a gap to errors, which being by command from the higheſt authoritie on earth, preached by ſo many, and not ſo much as contradicted by one, muſt needs increaſe to a wonderful height. Would any wiſe Law-makers proceed thus, if they could help it as well as Chriſt could, by continuing in his Church that infallibility which you will confeſſe it had thoſe two thouſand years before Scripture was written, and which this Church of Chriſt had before all the whole Canon of the New Teſtament was finiſhed, which was for the firſt fourty years of the Church.

7. Vain is your fear that we ſhould become Hypocrites in differing by one outward Act from our inward act of belief, for any wiſe man may inwardly perſwade himſelf, although I by my force of wit, cannot ſee how ſuch a point defined by a whole general Council ſhould be true; yet

yet if I have wit, I cannot but perſwade my ſelf even according to humane wiſedome, that ſo grave a judgement of a whole Council is far more likely to ſee the truth then my private judgement; and therefore rather to be interiorly imbraced. Again, I may diſcourſe thus. All the places alleadgeable againſt the Definitions of Councils, or of Scriptures, be places clear or not clear; if not clear, then clearly I am imprudent and impudent to oppoſe, in a point not clear, my private judgement of diſcretion againſt the publick judgement of all Chriſtendome, far more likely in a point not clear to hit upon the truth then I am. Now if theſe places alledgable againſt the Definitions of Councils be clear and evident, it is an evident and clear folly in me, to think that ſo wiſe an Aſſembly ſhould have ſo univerſal a blindneſſe, as that none of them ſhould be able to diſcover that which is clear and evident even in my ſhort ſight: See chap. 4. Numb. 51. Again I may and ought to know that the Holy Ghoſt hath promiſed an aſſiſtance to his Church ſufficient to ſecure it from bringing in any error as I ſhall ſhew, chapter 4 Numb. 28. 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35. And this Principle will beat down to the ground all Oppoſition which an humble ſoul can make, who will captivate her underſtanding in this caſe unto the obedience of faith as the Apoſtle ſpeaketh.

8. And when you ask me, wherein you oppoſe general Councils? I anſwer, Firſt that you oppoſe them even in that moſt fundamental ground, upon which all Councils hitherto have ſtill ſuppoſed themſelves to ſet as Judges, with full Commiſſion to determine ſecurely all controverſies, obliging all Chriſtians to conform to their Definitions by ſuch Cenſures as were ſtill held to be ratified in Heaven. Others will tell you divers other Oppoſitions you have with Councils, and even in this place you tell all how little you credit Councils when you charge them with ſpeaking contradictions. But when you come to ſpeak your mind more largely, you do your uttermoſt en-

vours to make the world think that they have not ſufficient aſſurance that any Council was as yet a Lawful General Council. I need no further proof of theſe your endeavours then all thoſe manifold Objections which you put, and I anſwer in my 4. chapter Numb. 20. 21.

9. And when you ask again why you are charged as if you were oppoſite to the true *Catholike Church*? I anſwer, Chriſt had in all ages ſince his time, a true *Catholik Church*, and conſequently he had ſuch a Church upon earth when your Reformation (as you call it) began. But at this your Reformation you did oppoſe in very many, and very important points of doctrine, not onely the *Roman*, but all other Churches upon earth: Therefore without doubt you oppoſed the *truly Catholike Church* in many, and very important points. And in plain *Engliſh* I tell you, this argument (which is in lawful form) is unanſwerable. And when you ſay, that *when you differ without oppoſition you keep the peace of the Church without queſtion.* I anſwer, That your Reformers did apparently in many and moſt important points differ from all Churches Chriſt had then upon the Earth, in opinion of publick Doctrine; cenſuring ſuch and ſuch Points as they *all held*, to be *Erronious*, *Superſtitious*, *oppoſite to the Word of God*; and in this oppoſition you continue ſtill, though in this whole age you have not been able to name one age in this laſt thouſand years, in which *Chriſt had a truly Catholike Church upon Earth*, agreeing with you in thoſe many and moſt important points in which your Reformers taxed us to have oppoſed the Scriptures. And as for exterior diviſion you cannot name the Church upon earth from which you did not divide your ſelves at your Reformation. And I challenge you to tell me if you can, to what Church on Earth then viſible you did joyn your ſelves, or who acknowledged you to be of their communion?

10. To prove yet further that we are not bound to ſubmit our judgements to the Church, you uſe (as you ſay) my

my own argument, That we are bound to submit our judgement onely to those who can judge of the inward act. But Sir, I never laid any such thing, for how know we whether the Scripture Writers, or the Apostles themselves did know (without which knowledge they could not judge) of the interior Acts of all men, from their time to the end of the world? and yet all these men, upon due Proposition of their Doctrine, are obliged to submit their interior acts to their Doctrine. But I said that which you had rather a mind to mistake, then answer. For I said, *That Christ should have left a very miserable Church, and should have gathered a most heart-dis-united sort of people, if after the reading of Scriptures* (after which they wrangle so fiercely) *He had left them no other Judge but their own private judgements subject to such varietie in understanding the Scriptures, what Law-maker* (said I) *will ever so inconsiderate as to leave only a Book of Lawes to his Common-wealth without any living Judge, to whom all were to submit?* Then I added, *True it is, that to submit exteriorly to Temporal Judges sufficeth, they being able onely to judge of the exterior man.* Did I say this of general Councils? No, did I not, as it were to prevent your Objection, expresly adde, *But God* (in whose name the Church teacheth, and commandeth all which she teacheth and commandeth) *searcheth the heart and the reynes and looketh upon the minde* (*which is the seat of true or false beliefs*) *This God, I say, chiefly exacteth that those of his Church be of one faith interiorly, or else they be not of one faith; for faith essentially consisteth in the interior judgement. He hath all reason to exact that interiorly they be all of one faith. For he could not seriously have desired their salvation, without he required of them* (by way of most rigorous obligation) *to do that which is so wholy necessary to salvation, that without it no man is saved. For without true faith it is impossible to please God.* This and much more to this effect, I presse there hotly, and yet I am not so much as answered coldly.

But

11. But you skip to my admiration at your doctrine which indeed giveth a very admirable licence to any Cobler to peruſe the Decrees of general Councils, and to reject them too, if in his review of them he doth not find them Reſolved into the infallible text of clear Scripture. Of which Doctrine I have already ſpoken fully (Num. 4.) And I think I had reaſon to ſay that the wiſeſt man in the world is then moſt likely to erre, when, in his interiour judgement he goeth quite contrary to all Chriſtendome. Of this I have given a very cleat Reaſon here in my 7. Number, which will ſtop your mouth from calling every where, to have me prove the Churches infallibility until you come to my 4. chapter; or if it doth not, I muſt deſire you in this place to turn unto it. And in the very next chapter I ſhall ſhew, that (though the Scripture be moſt infallible) yet it is not ſufficient by it ſelf alone (unleſſe you take it as it ſends us to the Church) to decide all controverſies. As for Saint *Athanaſius*, did ever he oppoſe his judgement againſt the Definition of a lawful general Council? Nay, did it not appear by the Council of *Nice*, ſtanding for his Doctrine, that he might well know the true Church lawfully aſſembled under the lawful Paſtor confirming their Acts would teach as he taught. And becauſe he knew this authority (relying on the aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt) to be more then humane, he might well oppoſe a greater human authority.

By the way it is ſtrange you ſhould carp at us for calling our ſelves *Roman Catholiks*, as if ſay you, no others were Catholikes, whereas to avoid this very ſtrife impertinent now to our purpoſe, I uſed that very name by which no others are excluded. And in this impertinent ſtrife you ſay many things of which you prove not one.

12. I paſſe to that which is pertinent to the purpoſe, that it is a very deſperate conſequence flowing from the premiſſes of your Doctrine, permitting any private perſon ſo to peruſe the Definitions of Councils, that he might freel

freely reject them in his private judgement (which is the ſeat of all Faith) if he judged them not to be reſolved into the infallible authority of Scripture, upon this ground, that we have nothing infallible but the Texts of Scripture. For theſe Texts being not able to decide all neceſſary controverſies (I ſtill adde unleſſe you take them as they ſend us to the Church, by themſelves, as I ſhall fully ſhew in the next Chapter, it is clear that we ſhall remain diſputing without end, or poſſibility of end, unleſs God hath given an infallible aſſiſtance to the Church; wherefore not to grant ſuch an abſurdity, we are neceſſitated to expound thoſe Scriptures, promiſing that Chriſt will *be with his Church unto the end of the world, That he will ſend them the Spirit of Truth to abide with them to teach them all Truth, that the Gates of Hell ſhall not prevail againſt her. That we muſt hear her under pain of being accounted Publicans and Heathens, That ſhe is the Pillar and ground of Truth*, and diverſe others of which I ſpeak, chapter 4. to be extended to an infallible aſſiſtance, for an aſſiſtance joyned with fallibilitie will ſtill leave us jarring, as appears by our own Doctrine.

13. Being loath to ſtand too long to ſuch a conſequence, you make a long impertinent diſcourſe about the peruſal of the collection of all the judgements of all the Fathers, of all Ages, every where. Good Sir, tell me what connexion hath the peruſal of every judgement, of every Father, of every Age, every where, with that Obligation which I put of following theſe Canons of Councils which make to the deciſions of thoſe moſt known controverſies about which we contend? Is the judgement of every Father of every Age, the judgement of a general Council? Why then do you run your ſelf out of breath in impugning that which is nothing to our purpoſe, and which I never ſpake of, rather then in holding cloſe to the matter. But ſince you firſt bring the authority of Councils to a little more then nothing, and here again

the

the authority of the Fathers, to a little leſſe then nothing, in order to the ending of controverſies; this your violence againſt any provocation, to Antiquity, and conſent of Fathers, Will give me leave to make this Treatiſe much ſhorter then at the beginning appeared poſſible. For it is evident out of your own words that it is to no end to deal with you out of Fathers, and I am reſolved to deal with no body but to ſome end. I will therefore humour you in this, and I will lay aſide all that might hereafter be ſaid concerning the Opinion of Fathers. But do not think that I do this, as if that what you here ſaid againſt the authority of Fathers, found any credit with me, or as if what you ſay were in the leaſt degree hard to be anſwered. For you your ſelf cannot be ignorant that we alledge plenty of ſuch Holy Fathers againſt you, as are confeſſed by your ſelves to have been the prime Doctors of the Primitive Church. And we find ſufficient of their works which have not periſhed, never taxed by any (but confeſſed Hereticks) to be erroneous in theſe points in which they hold with us, whereas their ſmall errours uſed preſently to be diſcovered, and cried down. We find alſo ſufficient plenty of ſuch works as never were ſuſpected to be baſtard pieces, or to have been corrupted; And it would make a learned man amazed to ask, as you do, *How few of them have touched upon our differences?* Are you ignorant that our learned *Coccius* hath filled a great, and a very great double tome onely with the words of Holy Fathers oppoſite to your Doctrine in thoſe points in which we differ. *Gualterus* did ſingle out twelve points (in which our chief differences do conſiſt,) And he ſheweth (in his Chronicle at the end of every age from Chriſts time to this,) ſufficient plenty of Holy Fathers, to Demonſtrate, what the prime Paſtors of the Church (followed by the people,) did believe in every one of thoſe Ages, concerning theſe very prime points, in which we differ from you. The Author of the *Progeny of Catholikes and Proteſtants*, handling a part all

our

our main differences, doth in all these points, give you the very words of your own chief Doctors, clearly acknowledging a great number of Holy Fathers, directly oppoſite unto them in each one of thoſe points. Do but pleaſe to look at the end of this Author upon his *Table of Books and Chapters*, and you may find that which I have ſaid verified, in what point or points you pleaſe. Groundleſs then is the whole Diſcourſe againſt arguing out of Holy Fathers. And indeed your Doctors would fain diſpute out of Scriptures onely, becauſe they find it to be true that the Scriptures alone cannot decide many Controverſies, but by ſome Interpretation or other they think themſelves able to elude the force of arguments drawn from Scriptures onely: the ſayings which are not in Scripture, are in no caſe receivable by them, whereas indeed, there is no good got by diſputing of Texts of Scriptures, but either to make men ſick or mad, as our adverſaries may daily ſee by their fruitleſs Scripture combates with the Anabaptiſts, the Sabatharians, and other upſtart Sectaries. But the Church of God is the Kings high way, by which a man is ſure to travail to truth. There ought therefore to be no appealing to Scriptures, nor diſputing out of them only, ſince by that means, either neither ſide will be victorious, or it is a hazard whether. Theſe things you might have learned from the ancient Fathers if you had regarded their Doctrine, yet ſince their authority hath ſo low a place in your eſteem in order to finding out the truth, to humor you, I will lay aſide all that might be ſaid out of the Fathers.

I cut then off (by your own conſent) all you ſay concerning S. *Cyprian*, and the Criſis of S. *Auſtin* concerning S. *Cyprian*; yet have I a great mind to tell you that S. *Auſtin* expreſſed exceeding well that *Humility* and *Charity* be thoſe two vertues which made S. *Cyprian* (and ought to make us) ſubmit to general Councils, as a prime part of our bounded duty; humility, whereſoever it is found is the *Actus imperans* of a moſt ſubmiſſive Obedience to the Orders of thoſe,

whom under pain of damnation we are to obey. Becauſe the Devils had not this Humility in ſubmitting themſelves to God, and the obedience due to him, their Rebellion is aſcribed to pride, which for the ſame reaſon is ſtyled; *The Mother of ſinne.* Now as Humility bringeth with her this neceſſary ſubmiſſion in the interior, ſo Charity is the Vertue which will be ſure to ſee that peace and Unity be kept exteriorly in the Church. Grant this ſubmiſſion to all Councils and we have done.

Of my fourth and fifth Number.

15. God on his part hath given us an excellent means to be ſurely guided in our interior (in which faith conſiſts) by following the Church the Kings high way ſurely leading to Truth; *take away this means* (recommended ſo often for this end by Scripture) and you ſhall ſee how pittifully we are left unprovided in order to exterior Unity. But you preſſe to have my diſcourſe to this effect drawn into a ſyllogiſm, which you do for me. But I hope to do it yet more clearly for my ſelf in this manner. Under pain of damnation all are bound to agree in this; that every one interiorly giveth an infallible aſſent to all ſuch points as are neceſſary to be believed for ſalvation. But all can never be brought to agree in giving interiourly this infallible Aſſent to all ſuch points, without they ſubmit their Aſſent to ſome living Judge indued with infallibility: Therefore all can never be brought to agree in that, in which they are bound to agree under pain of damnation, without they all ſubmit their interior aſſent to ſome living Judge indued with infallibility. The firſt Propoſition is clear; becauſe all are obliged to pleaſe God, and to have that *faith, without which it is impoſſible to pleaſe God.* The ſecond Propoſition is proved thus. An infallible aſſent cannot be built but upon ſubmiſſion to an infallible authority, and no other infallible authority ſufficient to breed this agreement in their interior aſſent to all points neceſſary, can be aſſigned but the authority of the Church. The Authority of the Scripture, though infal-

lible

lible doth not give us clear Texts to ground our infallible assent upon them in all points necessary to salvation, as I shall shew in the next chapter. And we see with our eyes those who submit to this authority of Scripture as infallible, to disagree mainly in these very points; for one thinketh in his conscience these Scriptures to be understood one way, another thinketh in his conscience they are so be understood one other way, & this other is licensed by you to differ from the former, for you licence such a man to differ even from the greatest authority upon Earth, to wit, a general Council, much more easie must you be to licence him to differ from an other private man: and that other private man hath as good ground to differ from the other. What possible means is here of Union in the interior man in which faith onely doth consist. What you adde of God his sufficiently providing for his Church by Scripture onely, is in this sence true, that in Scripture we read that we are *to hear the Church*, not that Scripture alone by her self endeth all our controversies as partly hath been proved, but shall now more copiously be performed in my next chapter, in which you shall find all that you adde in this place presently answered, after I have fully set down the state of the question.

## The third CHAPTER.

### *That seeing Scripture alone doth not decide all things necessary to salvation, there must be a living Judge.*

1. YOu deliver your Opinion in your answer to my third Number page 12. *As towards controversies we say that Christ hath sufficiently provided for the salvation of man in regard of means of Knowledge without an infallible*

*Judge on Earth, because things necessary are plainly set down in Scripture.* And in another place you say, *what is not plainly delivered in Scripture is thereby signified not to be necessary.* Of this your opinion no proof was given by you untill you come unto this present place. Here then I will begin to discusse this Question: And first I will take leave to state this Question a little more fully, and distinctly.

2. Your Assertion then is, *That all things necessary to salvation are plainly set down in Scripture.* In this Assertion there be 2 things which need a full and distinct declaration. The first is to declare these words, *Necessary to salvation.* The second to declare those other words, *Plainly set down in Scripture.* And first concerning those words *Necessary to salvation,* they must of necessity be understood so, that all things are plainly set down in Scripture, which are necessary. *First,* to the Universal Church as it is a communitie. *Secondly,* all things which are necessary to all States, and Degrees that must needs be in this community. *Thirdly,* all things necessary to every single person bound to be of this community. As for the first, the Church being intended to be a community diffus'd through the whole World, and intended for a Perpetuity, must, by infallible authority be plainly told in what manner she is in all times and places to be provided of lawful Pastors, and that with perpetual Succession; and what power these Pastors have either in respect of one another, or in respect to their particular flocks, and what Lawes they may make, either single in regard of their flocks, or assembled in regard of the whole community; and how many, to this effect must be assembled; who must call their assembly, who perside in it, when it is to be accounted lawful when an unlawful assembly. Whether the Precepts of this assembly oblige under pain of damnation, to the keeping (for Example) of any Feast, as *Christmasse, Ascension,* or any Fast, as the Fast of *Lent,* of *Christmasse Eve,* and to this communitie

community it is alſo neceſſary to know what publick ſervice may and ought to be impoſed upon all, and when all are bound to be preſent at it. What Sacraments are to be adminiſtred, by whom, when the people are bound to uſe them, and how often, and in what manner and form they muſt be Adminiſtred. All theſe things are neceſſary to the Chuch as a community, and yet there is not one of all theſe things plainly ſet down in Scripture, whence very many and very important differences be amongſt Chriſtians, all undecidable by Scripture. Some of you contend according to Scripture that there muſt be Biſhops with ſuch and ſuch Power and Authority, and that without them you can have no true Prieſts or Deacons, and without theſe no true Sacraments, things ſo neceſſary to the ſalvation of all men. Others anſwer in the words of your own doctrine, *What is not plainly delivered in Scripture, is thereby ſignified not to be neceſſary.* But it is not plainly delivered in Scripture that the Church ſhould be governed by Biſhops *with ſuch and ſuch authoritie.* That Prieſts ſhould be Ordained with ſuch and ſuch a Form, that none but Prieſts ſhould have Power to bleſſe the Bread, adminiſter the Sacraments; That this Bread muſt be Wheat-bread or Barley, or Oaten or Peaſe-bread. Therefore all theſe things are ſignified not to be neceſſary. The ſame Argument might be made of other ſuch like Controverſies, which certainly be no leſſe neceſſary then the former to be decided; Though according to their Doctrine none of them ſhould be neceſſary; Or, if neceſſary, they ſhould be decidable by plain Scripture, and then your Doctours could not jarre about them, as they doe. Some of you will have no words at all neceſſary to the Adminiſtration of Baptiſme, ſome will have ſuch kinde of words, and others, words very different from them in ſubſtance.

3. Secondly,

Secondly, to speak now of such things as are of strict necessity to certain men, of certain states and degrees in the Church. Your Bishops must know how to ordain Priests, and with what form of words or actions. Where shall they find this plainly set down in Scripture? They must also know whether they can lawfully permit women to baptize at all, or baptize in necessitie onely, and not out of it? Whether they may permit women or lay-men to blesse the bread, and distribute the Sacrament, seeing that Christ said, *Do this all*; not plainly expressing how far these his words extended themselves. Priests must know what kind of Ordination is necessary for their Function, what commission is necessary for their lawful Missions, and whether it can be granted by Lay-men, or no? as also their power to make and administer Sacraments, and yet none of these are plainly set down in Scripture, and endlesse controversies there be about them.

Thirdly, divers of the former things not set down plainly in Scripture, are necessary to be known by all men all being obliged to serve God in a true Church, having a lawful succession of true Pastors truly ordain'd themselves, and truly ordaining their Priests, who must be known to Administer true Sacraments in their true matter and form, preaching also the Word of God by lawful Mission. It is necessary to the salvation of every man to believe and doe somethings, and not to do some other things not plainly set down in Scripture. Every one is to believe some things distinctly. Now which these things be, or how many, Scriptures expresse not. Every one is bound not to work upon the Sunday. Every one is bound not to have two wives at one time, not also to marry within such and such a degree of consanguinity. Where be all these things plainly set down in Scripture? Of divers other things we shall yet say more. Yet even hence appeareth how many endlesse difficulties these words of yours *Necessaric to salvation* bring with them.

5. Other

5. Other endleſſe difficulties be ſuperadded by thoſe other words *Plainly ſet down in Scripture*. *Firſt*, to prove a point plainly ſet down in Scripture, ſo that I infallibly know the undoubted true ſence of it, I muſt firſt know ſuch a book to be the true, and undoubted Word of God, which (as I ſhall ſhew, Numb. 20.) cannot be known by Scripture, at leaſt by thoſe who can truly ſwear that they are no more able, by the reading of the book of *Numbers* for example, to diſcover in it any Divine Light, ſhewing it to be true Scripture, more then they diſcover in the books of *Judith* or *Toby* ſhewing them to be true Scripture. *Secondly*, they muſt infallibly ſhew that this very Verſe, in which I find this point is not thruſt in among other true parts of Scripture, or ſome word changing the ſenſe, either thruſt in, or left out in this Verſe; and this they muſt know infallibly. *Thirdly*, after all this they muſt yet further know, and that infallibly, whether theſe true and uncorrupted words of Scripture be taken in this place in their common ſenſe, or taken Figuratively, or ſpoken myſtically of ſome other thing. Now how is it poſſible by Scripture onely to come to have an infallible knowledge of this, for it dependeth merely on the ſecret free will of God to uſe theſe words here either Myſtically or Figuratively, or in their plain vulgar ſenſe. To know, and that infallibly, This ſecret free-will of God, I muſt have a Revelation, and ſuch a one as no doubt can be made of it. Where find I this Revelation in Scripture? *Fourthly*, your learned *Sanctius, De Sacra Scriptura, (Col. 409.)* having ſaid, *That Holy Scripture in theſe things which are neceſſary to ſalvation is clear*; he aſſigns no fewer *then nineteen Rules neceſſary to the true knowledge thereof*; beſides the *having the Spirit of God, and the reading the Scripture attentively, and the underſtanding the words and places thereof.* And *Scharpius in Curſu Theologico de Scripturibus controverſ. 8. P. 44.* aſſigneth *twenty Rules* for the underſtanding the Scripture, *which unleſs they be kept we cannot but erre.* But ſurely

ſurely it is very eaſie to keep them. No ſuch matter; For he exacts *to know Original Languages to diſcuſs the words, Phraſes, and Hebraiſms, to confer the places which are like, and unlike to one another, &c.* Tell me now, do all theſe, and the former Rules, ſhew a plain, eaſie way to infallibility; eſpecially, we having no ſure knowledge that all theſe fallible Rules, will at laſt produce infallibility. Good God! *Is this the way promiſed to be ſo direct unto us that fools cannot erre by it. Fifthly*, I muſt adde a ſaying of your ſo much eſteemed *Chillingworth*, who (in his Præface *Numb.* 30.) ſaith, *No more certain Signe that a point is not evident, then when honeſt, and underſtanding, and indifferent men, and ſuch as give themſelves Liberty of Judgement, after mature conſideration of the matter, do differ about it.* About how many points do you, and your Brothers differ? which I have in this Chapter ſhewed to be points mainly neceſſary to Salvation, which according to this Rule of knowing what is evident, what not, are evidently not ſet down plainly in Scripture: And to ſpeak the plain truth, this ground upon which you, and yours are ſtill forced to ſtand, ſo to withſtand the neceſſity of one Infallible living Judge, ſeemeth a plain Paradox.

6. In one ſenſe (as I have often noted) we ſtill grant all things neceſſary to Salvation to be ſet down in Scripture, to wit, in theſe Texts in which the Scripture bids us *Hear the Church*, and that *under pain of being accounted* (by a ſentence ratified in Heaven) *Publicans and Heathens*, and *that the Gates of Hell ſhall not prevail againſt Her*; by any falſe Doctrine, that *She is Pillar and Ground of Truth*; That *the Holy Ghoſt abideth with her for ever teaching her all Truth*, *That Gods Spirit ſhall not depart from the Mouth of her ſeed, nor her ſeeds ſeed.* And ſuch like places which I ſhall in due place (Chap. 4. Num. 58. to 64.) ſhew, moſt forcibly to prove this verity. And the very reading of them, ſheweth them to be no leſs plain, and cleer to this purpoſe, then thoſe places, which

which you cry out to be evident for the proof of every point which is necessary to salvation. And I am sure you can bring no such evident Texts for all, yea, for any of these points, which I have already said in this chapter not to be evidently set down in Scripture, though they be of prime necessity, as others also which I shall by and by adde. The Scripture alone by it self, (in which sense you speak) doth not (as these places will demonstrate) set down all things necessary to salvation, yet she setteth down (and that first more clearly then she doth set down many such necessary points) a Command to go to the Church for our full instruction. So Saint *Paul* was taught all things necessary for his knowledge by those few words, (*Act 9. 6.*) *Goe into the City, and it shall be told what thou must do.* That all might see this City of the Church, he placed it on a Mountain, whence all necessary points are delivered from a living Oracle, speaking so distinctly, that no doubt can remain of the true sense, or if there be made any doubt of any thing of importance, this doubt will presently be cleared by some new Declaration authentically notified unto us by our Pastours and Doctours, which God gave us (as the Scripture saith) *That we should not be children wavering and carried about with the wind of false doctrine with circumvention of error.*

7. But to go on with your Assertion, all things necessary to salvation (say you) are plainly set down in Scripture. This is your main foundation of Faith, making you not onely to take Scriptures, but to take Scriptures onely, and nothing but Scriptures for the ground of your Faith, this ground I say must needs be plainly set down in Scripture, otherwise according to your own words, *What is not plainly delivered in Scripture is thereby signified not to be necessary.* Again, if this be not plainly set down in Scripture, it will remain uncertain to us, whether God did intended to have all such necessary things taught us by the

Scripture taken by it self alone; or whether God intended the Scripture for divers other ends, providing sufficiently for this end by sending us to the Church for our further instruction. That then which I call for again, and again, is to have plainly set down to me in Scripture, *that God intended by the Scriptures taken by themselves all alone, to furnish us with infallibility all things necessary to salvation*; shew me the Texts.

8. You go about to shew me them. And first you press the second time that of Saint *Paul* to *Timothy*, 2. 15, 16. Take for my first answer that which I gave you when you first alledged this place, chap. 1. Numb. 3. And you must pardon me if I say, that place speaketh of Scriptures interpreted by the Church, to whom I think it is fitter to give this Office, then to let every Cobler usurp it as I have shewed you do, chap. 1. Numb. 2. and chap. 2. Numb. 4. The Scriptures thus profaned, and by such interpretations truly discanoned (as I may say) are rather subject to that effect which Saint *Paul* his Epistles, (according to St. *Peter*) had with some men, that is, they are subject to be depraved by them to the perdition of their Interpreters: where (by the way) you are again to take notice, that St. *Peter* saith, Interpreters depraved those places of Saint *Paul* to their damnation, though these places were hard, as Saint *Peter* saith, and consequently these places, did not (according to your doctrine) contain points necessary to salvation. Whence you see that your proceedings in allowing much liberty of Interpretations even in hard points may easily prove damnable. It was then true which I told you in another place, That though the Scripture be a most right Rule, yet it is very commonly so crookedly applied, that we stand in need of a better security of the interpretation of it (in which the very carnel of the Letter doth consist) then we have of the interpretation (finally stood unto) made by the private judgement of our own discretion. I know your Answer is, that it is accidental to this

Rule

Rule to be misapplied, and that this cannot infringe the authoritie of Scripture. It doth not indeed infringe the Authority of Scripture used as God would have it used, with due submission to the publick interpretation of his Church. Otherwise, not for want of infallibilitie in Scripture, but by the abundance of fallibility in our private judgements of discretion, it followeth, that we poor creatures, shall be subject to be misled most pittifully, without God doth provide us of an infallible interpreter. Neither is this to speak more irreverently of Scripture then Saint *Peter* spoke of Saint *Pauls* Epistles. Nothing more clear then that the words of Scripture are capable of several senses, and when the senses be several, it must needs depend upon the inward and most secret intention of God to have had an intention to use these words to such or such a sense onely, or to both if he pleased. How shall we infallibly know Gods secret intention but by an interpreter, having infallible assistance from the same Holy Spirit, who assisted those who did write the Scripture. Wherefore we cannot but wonder to see, how much scope you give to such poor creatures as ignorant men are, by thrusting the whole Bible into every mans hands, and investing him with so ample a faculty to interpret it, without any interior submission to the Church (although the interior judgement be the very seat of damnable error, or saving Truth) that he may follow in his judgement what he shall sincerely judge to be truest. In so much, that he may in his own interpretation, stand out in his judgement, against the interpretations of whole General Councils. And yet this very self same man is wisely by you sent to the Minister. *And any Minister of the Gospel* say you (but I must not say, (Any General Council) *is able competently, through the Scripture to direct the people to their happiness. And the Scripture was inspired to this purpose.* Happy Ministers! Happy people led so securely! Only unhappy misled people are we, who had rather say, *The Scripture was inspired, that*

*through it General Councils might ſecurely direct the people to their happineſs*, then ſay with my good adverſary, *any Miniſter of the Goſpel is able competently through the Scripture to direct the people to their happineſſe, And the Scriptures were inſpired to this purpoſe.* Doe but allow me this to the Church, that it can competently through the Scripture direct the people their happineſs, and we will not contend with you whether this competent direction to happineſs ſhall be called an infallible direction or no: though we think it moſt certain, that no fallible direction can competently direct the people to happineſs. Now becauſe by the way I did ſay our Church could not erre *in damnative errors*, you conceive me to grant that it may erre in points *not damnative*. No Sir, when I ſaid theſe words, I did only take, and ſubſume that, which you your ſelves moſt commonly grant unto the Church, that it cannot erre in damnative matters. This alone giveth her a main advantage over any Miniſter or any private Interpreter. This alone giveth a demonſtrable reaſon, why we ſhould not follow our own interpretations, which may be damnative; as thoſe interpretations were which ſome men made of Saint *Pauls* Epiſtles to their own perdition, as Saint *Peter* ſaith. And ſurely ſuch Interpretations are then likely to be damnative when they are flatly contrary to the Interpretations of the Church. What Commiſſion the Church had for her infallibilitie I ſhall ſhew in due place.

And to ſhew it more fully I will preſs again your Text and give a ſecond anſwer unto it by anſwering the words following, which are. *All Scripture is given by Inſpiration of God, and it is profitable for Doctrine, for Reproof, for Correction* (ſo your Bible reads) *for inſtruction in righteouſneſſe.* Is it given by Inſpiration? yes. What prove you from hence, but that you and yours have a notable Talent in not concluding contradictorily. You ſhould conclude thus. *All Scripture is given by Inſpiration of God.*

*But*

*But all Doctrine given by Inſpiration from God containeth plainly all things neceſſary to ſalvation. Therefore all Scripture contains plainly all things neceſſary to ſalvation*, & it doth this taking the word, *Neceſſary*, and the word *plainly* as I have ſhewed they muſt be taken in the beginning of this chapter. Well but you will hit of it by and by, after three or foure Conſequences of no Conſequence. For you goe thus on, *Is not all Scripture profitable for Doctrine?* Yes, in a high Degree it teacheth moſt eminent Vertues, and among other Vertues it teacheth moſt wholeſome ſubmiſſion, and obedience to the Church, and by her all things neceſſary for ſalvation. And thus the Scripture by her ſelf alone is very profitable. But Sir, I expected a Contradictory Concluſion. Deduce me from theſe words, this Conſequence *Ergo, God intended by the Scriptures alone to teach us with infallibilitie all things neceſſarie to ſalvation, or all things neceſſary to ſalvation are plainly ſet down in Scripture* ſtill underſtanding theſe words as I in the beginning ſhewed they muſt be underſtood. Go on. *Is it not profitable for reproof?* Yes Sir. But where is the contradictorie Concluſion I expected? *Is it not profitable for correction?* Yes. But *I want* ſtill this Contradictorie Concluſion. *Is it not profitable for inſtruction in Righteouſneſſe?* Yes. And now all your Powder is ſpent, and you have not hit the marke, for I have not yet the Contradictorie Concluſion I ſo long expected. Hear now a true Contradictorie Concluſion againſt your ſelfe out of this Text. That which in this Text is ſaid onely to be *profitable* for theſe ends, is not thereby ſaid *to be ſufficient even to theſe ends*, and yet much leſſe *ſufficient to end all Controverſies neceſſary to Salvation by it ſelf alone.* But the Scripture in this Text, is only ſaid *to be profitable* to theſe ends here expreſſed. Therefore it is not hereby ſaid *to be ſufficient and that by it ſelf alone* even to theſe ends, and much leſs *by it ſelf alone ſufficient to end all Controverſies*

*neceſſary*

*neceſſary to ſalvation*, plainly ſetting down what is to be held in all things neceſſary to Salvation. Again (for a third anſwer.) You cannot ſay St. *Paul* ſpoke theſe words of the New Teſtament, which for ſome fourty years, after Saint *Paul* ſpoke theſe words was not finiſhed. Therefore Saint *Paul* in this Text doth not ſo much as ſpeak of the whole Canon of Scripture, whence he is moſt weakly cited to prove from hence that the whole Canon containeth clearly all things neceſſary to ſalvation. Again when this is proved, it is manifeſt, that part of the whole Canon is loſt. How then know you that ſome neceſſary points, not delivered in other parts of Scripture, were not delivered in theſe parts of Scripture which have periſhed, and ſo are come not to be extant in writing? I deſire your Anſwer to this Queſtion.

Your ſecond Text to prove this is *Hebrews*. 4,12. *The Word of God is quick and powerful, and ſharper then any two edged ſword, piercing even to the dividing aſunder of Soul and Spirit, and it is a diſcoverer of the thoughts and the intents of the heart.* Here is the Text, but where is the contradictory concluſion inferring, and that evidently, *That it is plainly ſet down in Scripture, that the Scripture by it ſelf alone is ſufficient to decide all neceſſary Controverſies?* You argue thus. *If you ſay the Word of God is a dead Letter it cannot ſpeak, it is denied. If you ſay the Word of God cannot act, it is denied it is active in you.* But Sir, What if I ſay the Word of God ſpeaks and ſpeaks clearly many moſt profitable things, and that it ſets down many moſt rare examples of Vertue, with excellent Principles, and Documents, and incitements to the ſame in a manner moſt forceable to ſtrike fire out of a flinty heart; do I not, when I ſay this, ſay all that you have ſaid? And when I have ſaid all this, where is that evident conſequence directly concluding, *That all controverſies neceſſary to ſalvation are plainly decided by Scripture alone?* But to come at laſt to this Conſequence you tell me, *If you ſay it cannot decide Controverſies what is ſaid here?*

It

*It is sharper then any two edged sword.* But good Sir, I pray, to what use is the Word of God said to be sharper then any two edged sword? can you shew me any one clear, and evident syllable in this Text, telling me plainly, that this sharpnesse is in order, not onely *to decide Controversies, but also all necessary Controversies, and to do this by it self alone.* Where is then your contradictory Conclusion? But I will from hence directly conclude, that according to your own doctrine Saint *Paul* could not say in this Text, that the Word of God, is by it self alone sufficient to decide all necessary controversies, which I prove. The Word of God according to your own doctrine was not sufficient to decide all necessary controversies before the whole Canon of the Scripture was compleatly finished. But Saint *Paul* said this of the Word of God before the Canon of the Scripture was compleatly finished; Therefore Saint *Paul* said this of the Word of God before the Word of God, was of it self alone sufficient to decide all necessary controversies. Therefore, *then it had been false* to say the Word of God had been sufficient to this end. Therefore St. *Paul* did not then say so. Again those words spoke not of the Word of God blunted with those interpretations which your opinion licenseth, but of the Word of God applied according to the Divinely-spirited interpretation of the Church, in whose hands, hands guided by the Holy Ghost, this Word of God is so managed for the decision of controversies, that it is sharper then any two edged sword. For her declarations of Scripture be not fallible, but proceed from the same Spirit by which the Scripture was made as I shall shew. And so here is no fear of missing the right interpretation. You may securely submit your interior assent to the guidance of the Holy Ghost. Where this guidance is neglected, there we see with our eyes controversies in most main points dayly multiplied, and yet the Bible dayly consulted, and not one of those Controversies so much as lessened, but still encreased more

and

and more. In these dayes he must put out his eyes who will not see this.

11. I have now answered the Texts you alledged in this place, but to the end that all the Texts, which you thought fittest to alledge to prove the most important Verity, may here be mustered up together, and their whole force appear to the full, I will set down here all the Texts which you alledge to this purpose. You then (page 52. in your answer to my 14. Numb.) urge, that Christ biddeth us *search the Scriptures*. But Sir, first you are to prove that these words clearly and evidently must of necessity be taken in the Imperative Mood, for without you do this, you can never prove evidently from hence that they contain a Command, and to prove this, especially evidently, is impossible. Because both the Greek and the Latine word is as truly and properly, and vulgarly the Indicative Mood as the Imperative, and our *English* Translatour might, if he had pleased, most faithfully have translated these words thus *you do search the Scriptures*. And Saint *Cyril* holdeth this to be the true sense *L.* 3. in *Jo. C.* 4. and your own great Dr. *Beza* holds the same. Secondly, suppose your Translator hath hit upon the right sense, and that Christ did indeed bid them search the Scriptures, because they clearly testifie that one point when he was the Messias, yet all this will help you to make no better consequence then you made before. And what a pritty conclusion is this. *Christ bids us search the Scriptures because they testifie clearly that one point of which he spoke; Therefore the Scriptures testifie clearly all that is necessary to be believed in any point of Controversie necessary to salvation.* And no better is this consequence, *Christ biddeth us search the Scriptures, therefore we are to attend them alone*, we are not to attend to the Voyce of *John*, nor the Voyce from Heaven biding all to hear him, not to his own preaching, and miracles. Is not this also a good consequence? Saint *Paul* saith, *if Women will learn any thing, let them ask their Husbands at home*

*home*, 1 Cor. cap. 35. Ergo, *women are not to learn of the Ministers of the Church.*

12. Your fourth Text is, *You erre not knowing the Scriptures.* Good Sir, give me now a Contradictory Conclusion. Shall it be this, *Therefore all things necessary to salvation are plainly set down in Scripture*; or rather this, *Therefore all things necessary to salvation are not plainly set down in Scripture*; For this is the far stronger consequence from these words. For had all things been plainly set down, they should not have erred; But they erred, Therefore all things were not plainly set down. Again, they might erre in the knowledge of the Scriptures, because in the reading of them they did follow their own private Interpretations, which is the most ready way to errour, especially when men oppose the publick Interpretation of the Church, as I shewed chap. 1. Numb. 3. last words, saith the *Bereans.*

13. Your first Text, is 2 Pet 1. v. 19. *We have also a more sure word of Prophesie, whereunto you do well that you take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place untill the day dawn and the Day-star arise in your hearts.* Your proof from this Text is just as weak, as the proof from the last Text but one; for just as that Text, so also this saith that, that one point, of Jesus his being the true Son of God, and the Messias, might clearly be found in the Scripture. How will you inferre? Ergo *All things necessary to salvation are plainly set down in Scripture*, because one thing is plainly set down. Every Veritie set down in Scripture is a most sure infallible Veritie. But, whence have you that every Verity necessary to salvation is set down in the Scripture? And yet again, where have you that all things necessary to Salvation were then set down plainly in Scripture when Saint *Peter* spoke these words, which he spoke many years before the whole Canon of Scripture was finished? But before the whole Canon was finished it was false to say, *All*

*things necessary to salvation were clearly set down in Scripture*; Therefore if Saint *Peter* had said this in this Text, he had said that which was false, Therefore, It is false that Saint *Peter* said in this Text, that all things necessary to salvation were plainly set down in Scripture.

14. Your next and last Text is *Act.* 17. where it is said of the *Bereans*, *They received the Word with all readinesse of mind, and searched the Scriptures dayly, whether those things were so.* Good Sir, whilest this text is now fresh in our minds, shew me here any one evident clear syllable which saith, the *Bereans* did search the Scriptures before they believed Saint *Paul*. Nay is it not first said, *They received the word with all readinesse of mind*, to wit, they received the Word as many other thousands did (whose proceedings you can never prove less laudable then the *Bereans*) upon those Motives which Saint *Paul* proposed unto them, before they searched the Scriptures, and being by these motives and instructions well illightned to understand the Scriptures, they for their further comfort and confirmation searched the Scriptures dayly to see whether they testified the same point: and this one point of our Saviours coming, being clearly in Scripture, perhaps Saint *Paul* might bid them search in such and such texts for it. Neither hence is it made evident that the Old Testament was thrust into every mans hand of the *Bereans*, but that they deputed their chief Doctours to make this search, and that for this one point onely. Whence (as I said before) your consequence from hence is very weak; That all points necessary to salvation are plainly set down in Scripture, because this one point was so. Yea, when the *Bereans* did search the Scriptures, no part of the New Testament was written, how strangely then do you prove from their search of the Old Scripture to find one point set down clearly, that all points necessary to be found are set down plainly, now the new Scripture is written.

15. Having now examined all the Texts upon which you

you did ground that main point, that all things necessary to decide all controversies are plainly set down in Scripture, and having found this point no where plainly set down, I frame hence plainly conclude, that the belief of this point is not plainly necessary; And I conclude this by your own words, *That what is not plainly set down in Scripture it thereby signified not to be necessary*; We are not therefore obliged to take the Scripture for our only Judge of controversies, for where is this Obligation plainly set down in Scripture? And for ought we can yet see there may be many prime controversies no where plainly decided, yea or so much as lightly insinuated in Scripture. And yet the Scripture wanteth not that glory of being sufficient to decide all imaginable controversies, because she teacheth us that Christ hath erected a *Church, built upon a Rock the pillar and ground of truth, having the Spirit of truth abiding with her to teach her all truths?* Frivolous is that Objection which saith, *If it be a point necessary to salvation to believe that the Church is to decide with infallible authority all our controversies we should find this plainly set down in Scripture.* Because as we have proved all this while, all points necessary to salvation be not plainly set down in Scripture, even such points as might import the ending of all controversies: to wit this your grand point, *All things necessary to salvation are plainly set down in Scripture*; Yea the Texts which I bring chap. 4. are a hundred times more clear to prove that the Church is to decide all our controversies, then that the Scripture by it self alone is to decide them, as any man may see by the attentive reading of these my Texts there and your Texts here. See there Numb. 58. 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65.

16. Though it might evidently serve to prove against you, That all things necessary to Salvation be not plainly set down in Scripture, that this very prime point is not plainly set down in Scripture, yet I have already in the beginning of this Chapter brought many other strong

proofs to which according to good order I should here add those many more which I am yet to bring. But you interpose so many things by the way, that I am forced to defer those other arguments. Yet that my Reader may know briefly what they are, and how many (and so read them here if he please,) I thought good to tell him that I prove yet further many necessary points to Salvation not to be plainly set down in Scripture. For we find not there set down evidently. *First*, Whether it be damnable to work upon the *Sunday*: see *Numb.* 39. *Secondly*, Whether the King be the head of the Church: see *Num.* 41. *Thirdly*, Which books be the undoubted true Canonical Scriptures: see *Numb.* 42. And *particularly*, Whether *St. Matthews* Gospel be the undoubted word of God: *Numb.* 42. 46. *Fourthly*, Whether it be clear in your opinion that Christ did not institute the Sacrament of Extreme unction: see *Numb.* 58. *Fifthly*, Whether also it be clear that Christ doth not give us his true body in the Sacrament: *Numb.* 59. *Sixthly*, I shew divers points necessary to Salvation, for which you cannot shew evident Scripture. As, *That God the Father is not begotten, God the Sonne is begotten and not made*: And that *he is Consubstantial to his Father*; *That God the Holy Ghost is neither made nor begotten, but doth proceed, and that both from the Father and from the Son*: see *Numb.* 60. *Seventhly*, I presse for an evident Text for Baptizing Infants, or bringing them to be baptized when Parents can, which you hold necessary for all Parents. *Numb.* 61. I might have added that great Question, *Whether it be necessarie to rebaptize those who be baptized by Hereticks*. For as Saint *Austin* saith *De Unitate Eccle. c.* 22. *This is neither openly nor evidently read* (in Scripture) *Neither by you nor by me. Yet if there were any wise man, of whom our Saviour had given testimony, and that he should be consulted in this Question, we should make no doubt.* (Mark this thou impugner of the infallibilitie of the Church) *We should make no doubt to performe what he*

*should*

*ſhould ſay; Leſt we ſhould ſeem, not ſo much to gainſay him, as to gainſay Chriſt, by whoſe teſtimony he was recommended? Now Chriſt beareth witneſs to his Church* And a little after: *Whoſoever refuſeth to follow the practice of the Church doth reſiſt our Saviour himſelf, who by his teſtimony commends the Church.* I alledge theſe words for their convincing reaſon, and not for the authority of Saint *Auſtin*, with whom you are ſo little ſatisfied.

17. But now I muſt ſatisfie ſuch queſtions as you are ſtill interpoſing againſt, what I ſaid; I ſaid then, that, being Scriptures cánot be ſhew'd for the deciſion of all neceſſary Controverſies, we muſt ſee further what Judge God hath appointed us to follow in the deciſion of them, & appointed us with an Obligation to ſubmit to him; becauſe *we gainſaying him, ſhould ſeem not ſo much to gainſay him as to gainſay Chriſt by whom this Judge was appointed to be heard by us*, juſt as Saint *Auſtin* diſcourſed now. But this our Diſcourſe pleaſeth not you. You ſay, *This ſpoyls all, contradicts all.* Becauſe you ſuppoſe that ſuch a Judge may contradict Scripture. Very likely! A Judge given by God, with a Commiſſion to direct all to ſalvation, and to that end aſſiſted *by his Spirit never departing from his mouth, but abiding with him for ever, to teach him all truth*, that he ſhould contradict the truth it ſelf. Is not this called contradiction, to ſay, that God can teſtifie of ſuch an one that he ſhall alwayes teach truth, the Spirit of truth never departing from his mouth, and yet to ſay that he ſhall contradict Scriptures. Vain therefore is your fear that there ſhould be ſolid reaſons grounded in Scripture, againſt the doctrine of ſuch a Judge, who himſelf is *the pillar and ground of truth*, and whoſe tongue is directed by the ſame Spirit who directed the Pens of thoſe who writ the Scripture.

Of my 6. Number.

18. This Spirit of truth did not direct that pen which in your paper did write that foul calumny, which you utter in theſe words. *We muſt then if he*, (the Pope) *ſaith Vices*

*are*

*are Vertues, ſay ſo too, as your* Bellarmine *determins in his fourth Book De Romano Pontifice C.* 5. Good Sir, read this place again, and ſee if you can hold bluſhing. If I ſhould diſcourſe thus with a child, and ſay, know (dear child) that in no poſſible caſe it is lawful to call Vice Vertue. And this child ſhould childiſhly ſay, Sir, How if God the Father ſhould ſay, ſuch a thing is a Vertue, and Chriſt ſhould preach that ſuch a thing were a Vice, were not I bound in this caſe to ſay that ſuch a Vertue is a Vice. Dear child would I ſay, this cannot happen. But if the child ſhould ſtill more childiſhly preſs me, Sir. But what if this ſhould happen? then I muſt ſay ſo, muſt I not? Yes (child) when, that ſhall grow to be poſſible, which is wholly impoſſible, *Then ſay, Vices are Vertues.* Would not this child be the veriеſt child that ever eſcaped the name of a fool; if he ſhould ſay, that I taught a caſe to be poſſible in which *Vices might be called Vertues.* *Bellarmin* ſaith in plain words *It is impoſſible the Pope ſhould erre* (eſpecially with a Council) *commanding any Vice.* And when he had proved this by other arguments he addeth alſo this proof, *That* (if he could command any Vice) *he then ſhould neceſſarily erre againſt faith* (which before he had proved he could not do) *ſeeing that Faith teacheth all Vertue to be good, all Vice to be bad.* Then to thoſe, who will childiſhly know, what the people muſt do when the Pope, who (with a Council at leaſt) cannot erre againſt faith, ſhould erre againſt Faith, he anſwereth, that when this impoſſible thing happeneth, the Church ſhould be bound to believe Vices to be good, and Vertues evil, unleſſe ſhe would ſin againſt her conſcience. Even ſo Sir, when Chriſt or Saint *Paul*, ſhall be found teaching that to be Vice, which God, had before in the old Scripture revealed to be Vertue, you ſhall be bound to hold it a Vertue, becauſe God hath revealed it in the old Scripture; and alſo that it is Vice, becauſe, Chriſt (truth it ſelf) taught it ſo in the New Teſtament. But you ſhall not be bound to this, untill that happen which cannot

cannot happen. And so said *Bellarmine* of the other Case; God forgive these wilful or exceeding careleſſe ſlanders.

19. Let us at last go on to see who must be our Judge in all Controversies, All Protestants do say, (as I noted) that the Scripture, and only the Scripture, is left us by Christ our Judge to end all Controversies. And in this their Tenet they agree with all Hereticks who have risen up against the Church of Christ. Here you fall upon me as if I spoke against the use of Scripture in Controversies. But Sir it is one thing to use Scripture for the proof of some points, and another thing to say Scripture, and only Scripture must be the Judge for all Controversies. To what end then is all you say against me as against one misliking the use of Scripture? The force of my argument in effect is this. All Offenders against the Law will never be so much their own condemners, as to choose, on their own accord, a Judge by whom they know they shall clearly be condemned. Therefore when we see all Offendors against Gods Law in point of Heresie, choose on their own accord, to be judged by Scripture, it is a manifest sign that they know, they shall never be condemned clearly by Scripture, whom they took, for their Judge, because (before they broached their errors) they knew all that this Judge would say against them. And they knew also by what glosses and interpretations they could escape the being clearly condemned, by any thing which their Judge could say. Is not this true? And is it not also true, that you give so ample scope to these kind of glosses and interpretations, that, if you in particular be perswaded that whole General Councils, one after another, have interpreted such Texts in a false sense, you may firmly believe your own particular interpretation. I think it would pose you, to find any Hereticks living before these dayes, who were so presumtious as to uphold any opinion which they held condemned

ned before in a lawful general Councel. No Catholick I am ſure did ever do it.

20. Now, by reaſon our Adverſaries are ſtill detracting from us, as if we detracted from Scripture, becauſe we hold that God did not intend by it alone (otherwiſe then by ſending us to the Church) to decide all Controverſies, I did ſhew that we onely did truly believe Scripture. For he onely truly believeth a thing with Divine faith, who groundeth his aſſent upon Divine Revelation. Our Adverſaries doe not doe this. We onely doe it. I will ſhew both theſe things to be true, though I be forced to be ſomewhat large, for I can no where more profitably enlarge my ſelf then in theſe things which touch the ground of Faith, about which our main Controverſie is. I ſay then that our Adverſaries do not by Divine Faith believe the Scriptures to be Gods Word. For no body can believe this, with Divine Faith, who doth not ground his aſſent to this truth upon Divine Revelation. But our adverſaries do not ground their aſſent to this truth upon Divine Revelation, for they can ſhew no where the Revelation upon which they believe ſuch and ſuch Books to be Gods Word. Shew me for example where God hath revealed that St. *Matthewes* Goſpel is the Word of God; ſhew me alſo the Revelation for which you believe other Books. What ſay you to this? You ſay *That the Canonical Books are worthy to be believed* (and ſo is the Book of *Toby* and *Judith* as well as theſe) *for themſelves, as we aſſent unto prime Principles in the habit of Intelligence by their own Light ſo we doe aſſent to Scripture to be the Word of God through the help of the Spirit of God as by its own Light.* And again, afterwards, *The Canonical Bookes* (why not *Toby* and *Judith*,) *bear witneſſes of themſelves. They carry their own light which we may ſee them by, as we ſee the Sun by its own light.* Good Sir, Have you brought all the infallibility of chriſtian Religion unto this laſt ground, and here left it on the ground to be trampled by *Socinians*?

ans? Do you expect that rational men should believe you: when you say in plain *English*, that, as the first Principals are so evident of themselves, that they need no proof; for example, *That the whole is greater then any part of the whole, that if this be equal to that, it is equal to whatsoever is equal to that*; so it is a thing, of it self evident, that such a book, (for example, Saint *Matthews* Gospel) is the true and infallible Word, and that this is so clear that it needs no other proof, but the reading of it to make it manifestly infallible; even as the Sun needs no other evidence then his own light to be manifestly known. All that you believe, you ground upon the Scripture, as upon the true Word of God; and when you are further pressed to know upon what ground you believe the books of Scripture to be the infallible Word of God, you confess in plain tearms, that the only infallible ground of this is, *that this is evident of its own self*, needing no further proof for the requiring an infallible assent unto it. Indeed you have brought your whole Religion to as pitiful a case as your Adversaries could wish it.

21. First, this ground is accounted a plain foolish ground by your renowned *Chillingworth*, whose book the most learned of both Universities have owned and magnified, notwithstanding his scornful Language of this ground of your whole Religion. *Chillingworth* then (P. 69. N. 49.) answering these words of his Adversary, *That the Divinitie of a writing cannot be known by it self alone, but by some extrinsecal authoritie*, Replieth thus. *This you need not prove for no wise man denieth it.* And *Doctor Covel* in his defence, Art. 4. P. 31. *It is not the Word of God which doth or possible can assure us that we doe well to think it the Word of God.* And Master *Hooker* writeth thus. *Of things necessary the very chief is to know what Books we are to esteem Holy, which point is confessed impossible for the Scripture it self to teach.* So he Eccl. Pol. L. 1. S. 14. P. 86. That which this man whom some call, *the most learned Protestant amongst the*

*English who put pen to paper*, that which this man and Dr. *Covel* holdeth *as an impossibility*, and consequently for a *mere Chymera*, you hold not onely possible, *but evident*, and not only evident *but as evident as the Sun; being seen by his own light*, and not onely so evident, *but evident with a sufficient certaintie to ground on infallible assent*, which is a far higher degree than the certainty we have of our seeing the Sun by his Light, which depends upon our fallible sense; but this must be an infallible ground, or else your faith of this cannot be infallible. Yea, your own self, when you least thought of it (when in another place I urged the necessity of a Church to judge all Controversies) acknowledge a greater necessity of such a Church to declare, by infallible authority, which Books be the true Word of God, which not; then to declare any other point; where as, if it had been true, that this point might as well be seen infallibly, by the onely reading of such Books, as the Sun is seen by his light, there should have been less necessity of such an infallible Declaration; for of all unnecessary things no thing would be more unnecessary then another light, by which we might see the Sun more clearly.

22. Secondly, there be many millions, who cannot truly and sincerely protest before God, and take it upon their salvations, that they are wholy unable, by the reading these books, to come to an infallible assurance that these be Gods Word, or to any such assurance as cometh neat infallibility. Now Sir, I pray tell me, what means hath God provided to bring these men to this infallible assurance, which they are obliged under pain of damnation to have? For he shall be damned who doth not infallibly believe the Scripture; If you tell me it is impossible that after fervent prayer to God they should still have no infallible knowledge, assuring them such and such books are Gods Word; I must needs tell you it is impossible for me, and (as I thinke) for any wise man to believe you.

23. Thirdly,

23. Thirdly, if your opinion of knowing true Scripture, by the reading of them, were true, then let but a Heathen, Turk, or Jew, read the Gospel, he must, by reading of it, see it as clearly to be Gods Word, as he must see the Sun by his light. And again, because all things necessary to salvation be plainly set down in the Word of God (as you teach) the same Heathen should plainly see all things necessary to salvation warranted him by the undoubted Word of God. If this were true, it is impossible that thousands should not be yearly converted by this means. How cometh it then to pass that the reading of Scriptures alone, did never find that concurrence of Gods grace to convert any single man (that we could hear of) whereas the Preachers of the Church of God have found this concurrence of Gods grace to the conversion of millions.

24. Fourthly, nothing being to be believed (as you teach) but Scripture, it followeth that the faith (by which we believe Scripture to be Gods Word) must be the very first ground of all faith upon which all is built, and the greatest light of Christian Veritie; how incredible a thing then is it, that this should be true, and that the prime Doctours of the Church, in none of their so many writings concerning our faith, should never mention this: and that no small glimpse of this light should be observable in the writings of all Antiquitie: In which the most observing eyes cannot espy the least glimpse of it. Reply, I think if the Doctours of the Primitive Church had told the Heathens that they had no better assurance for all the points of their (then new) faith then the Word of God written, and no greater assurance that such and such writings were his undoubted Word, then the very reading of those books did give them, by a light as evident as the Sun, the Heathens would have scoffed at them for saying that which they protested to be so visible, and yet none could see it but those who first believe it upon this evidence to them wholly invisible.

25. Fiftuly, I argue thus. Take a book, which you hold not to be Gods undoubted word; The book of *Toby* (for example) or *Judith*, and read these books over. And then take another book, which you hold to be Gods undoubted Word, for example, the book of *Numbers*, and read that over, or rather to end the sooner (read over only as many Chapters as be in the book of *Toby*, that is 16. and then I challenge you to tell me if you can (as surely you can if it be as cleare (as Sun shine) in what Chapter, Verse, or Word, any divine rayes (and such rayes as are sufficiently observable to produce an infallible assent, that such a book is Gods undoubted word) which rayes be not to the very full as observable in the same chapter and verse or equivolent word, of the book of *Toby*: What would you have us doe with our eyes to keep us from seing how clearly this is impossible for you to doe, which notwithstanding should be most easie, if your opinion were true or the truth.

26. Sixthly, if any one verse yea or any one small word, (especially this litle word *Not* be left out in any Chapter either through ignorance, malice or careleſnes of those writers, whose Copies our printed books have followed, whom will you be able to make believe that you are so sharp-sighted, as to see this omission by a light, sufficient for an infallible beliefe of it onely by the reading these Scriptures.

27. Seventhly, To prove that true general Councels be fallible you use often to alledge this argument, that one true generall Councell directly gainsaith another, which if you could prove) you should indeed prove that the Councils are fallible. But I can prove unto you that one who readeth the same book as well as you, and hath the true Spirit of God as well as you (if not in a larger measure) shall flatly say that Book not to be Gods Word, which you without all doubt affirm to be Gods infallible Word. This ground then of knowing which is, which

is

is not Gods Word, grounding contradictory opinions must needs be falſe, as I prove thus, *Luther* (whom you acknowledged by your common conſent to have had Gods Spirit, did read over the Epiſtle of Saint *James*, and held it to be *an Epiſtle of ſtraw*. He did read over the Book of the *Apocalips* or *Revelations* and held it *not to have beeu written by an Apoſtolical Spirit*. You read over theſe books, and proteſt ſo ſeriouſly, that by the light of them you infalliblely know them, to be Gods true Word. Your two opinions are flat contradictory, and yet they are both grounded upon this ground of reading theſe books with the Spirit of God.

Therefore this ground is fallible, and conſequently cannot ground an infallible faith of this point. But you have no other infallible faith of this point, but what is grounded on this fallible ground, *Ergo* the faith you have of this point is not an infallible, and divine faith, but a meer humane perſwaſion, ſuch as we have to believe the works, *Virgils* to have been written by *Virgil*. But if any deſire to have this caſe put in two Men, whom moſt of the world will more aſſuredly believe to have had the true Spirit of God, and to have had alſo as cleere-ſighted eyes, as moſt men we know in all mankind, I will put the caſe in the two prime Doctours of the Latine Church, Saint *Hierome*, and Saint *Auſtin*. Saint *Hierome* read over the bookes of the *Machabees*, and could not by the reading of them ſee them infallibly to be Gods Word. St. *Auſtin* read theſe books, and held them infallibly to be Gods Word. How came theſe two moſt ſharp-ſighted men to ſee quite contrary to one another by the ſelf ſame moſt clear Light, as you muſt ſay. But we deny that either of them did ſee this Light, and that by it onely they did ſee which were true, which falſe Scriptures. But we ſay they both followed in this point the propoſition of the Church, which Church in Saint *Hieromes* time had not clearly propoſed the book of *Machabees* to be Gods word. But the third Council of *Carthage* (at which *Auſtin* was preſent.)

declared

declared these Books to be Gods Word, and so Saint *Austin* held these Books infallibly to be Gods Word, grounding this his belief upon the Declaration of the Council at *Carthage*, which Council saith (*Canon* 47.) that it did set down these books for Scripture, *because we have received from our Fathers that those are to be read in the Church*. Saint *Hierome* had not seen this Council of *Carthage*; and because he was used to ground his faith, by which he believed such books to be, or not be Gods Word upon the Declaration of the Church, therefore until he did see that Declaration, he could not hold this as infallible, which Saint *Austin* afterwards held infallible because he had seen afterwards that Declaration of the Church. This is an excellent proof of our Opinions, and disproof of yours, which cannot give any kind of reason for their disagreeing in a thing so clear as you say this point is.

28. Hence you will see that this Evidence upon which you ground your infallible assent to believe Scripture, to be Gods Word (and then all the rest for Gods Word believed so ungroundedly) is not improperly by you compared to that Evidence, by which the first Principles, shew themselves to be evidently true, as this Principle doth, *It is impossible that any thing should be so, and yet not be so in all the self same circumstances*. For who ever did differ about such a Principle as this is. All men see the Evidence of these Principles. But none but a few of your sect, see the Evidence of what you say. Yea they evidently see there is no such evidence to be seen. And if you say that we must have a special spirit (that is, new eyes) to see it, Then you, who have this spirit, are all Prophets discovering by private Revelations made to your selves, that which all mankind besides could not and cannot discover. But now, when I see all, and every one of your belief, laying claime to the Sprit, assisting them even as farre as infallibility to the hardest of all points, I hope no prudent man will thinke that Gods Church may not lay claim

(with

(with a thousand times far greater reason) to the Spirit of the Holy Ghost assisting her even to infallibility in points of as much consequence, the Church having far more proof of his assistance, then every private Protestant. Perhaps because our Divines often call the Scripture, *An undoubted Principle, the first Principle*; you think they hold this Principle like the first Principle in Sciences, which are therefore indemonstrable, because they are of themselves as evident, as any reason you can bring to make them more evident. But the Scripture is onely said to be an unquestionable Principle, because it is already granted to be Gods Word by all parties. But why all grant it, all must give the reason, for the Scripture of it self cannot shew it self to be infallibly Gods Word as I have proved.

29. Eighthly and lastly, if you intend for the solution of any of the former Arguments (though you cannot escape most of them by that shift) to fly to the private assistance of the spirit, helping you to see that, which this light of the Scriptures alone cannot help them unto, then you must come infallibly to know you have this help from the spirit of truth: for if you know this onely fallibly, that will not help you to an infallible assent. Now how can you know this infallibility but by a Revelation secure from all illusion? Tell me how you came by this Revelation? Did *you trie the Spirit whether it were of God or no?* If no, how are you then secured? If you did, by what infallible means did you trie it? If you can by Scripture, we must needs laugh, because we speak of the first act of belief by which you, or any other first began to believe the Scripture to be infallibly Gods Word. Before you believed the Scripture to be Gods infallible Word you could not by it (as by a means infallible to your judgement) trie your spirit, and know it to be infallibly the Spirit of truth. Again, you could not know it to be the Spirit of truth, until you had first an infallible assurance that the

Scripture

Scripture (by which you did try it) was infallibly Gods true word. And yet again you could not have an infallible assurance that such books of Scripture were Gods infallible word, but by this infallible assurance you had, that this Spirit helping you to see this, was the Spirit of Truth: so that you could not be infallibly assured of your Spirit until you had infallible assurance that the Scripture was Gods Word; and you could not have infallible assurance that the Scripture was Gods Word untill you were infallibly assured of your Spirit; Is not this clearly to walk in a Circle with the wicked?

30. Having now shewed that you (who reject the infallibility of the Church) have left your selves no infallible ground, upon which you can believe that most Fundamental Article of belief, to wit, that such and such Books be infallibly Gods true Word; I am pressed to shew what infallible belief we have of this point, and how we avoid all Circle. I Answer that we ground the beliefe of this point upon the authority of the Church, *as being Infallible* in propoſing the Verities she hath received from God. This infallibility I do not suppose, but prove at large, Chapter 4. If you have not patience to stay, turn now to that place. You falsly say that *Whatsoever authority the Church hath towards this perswasion you also make use of as a motive to this faith.* She hath an infallible authority, which you count a fancy, and make no other use of it, but to scoff at it; and yet this infallibility alone must be that which groundeth, not this perswasion, but this infallible assent. Take the Church as a most grave assembly of pious learned men, without any infallible assistance of the Holy Ghost, and their authority is but humane, and so all the help you can have from them will not ground an infallible assent, which we must have in our belief, to hold Scripture infallible to be Gods Word. The Scriptures (as I have shewed) have no where revealed which bookes be Scripture, which not; and so we have

no

no other infallible ground lefts us but the authority of this Church, as alsuited infallible by the Holy Ghoſt. Some thing even in this place, I ſhall adde of this infallability ſo to ſatisfy your preſent longing.

31. But for the preſent you are endeavouring to include me in a Circle as I did you in the laſt objection *why I* ſay you) *do I believe the Scripture to be Gods word. Becauſe the Church ſaith it. Very Well. Why do I believe the Church? Becauſe the Scripture beareth witnes of it.* No Sir. You never heard me give this reaſon unleſſe it were when I ſpoke to one, who independently of the Church, did profeſſe him ſelfe to believe the Scripture ſo to be Gods Word, as you do, who profeſſe to believe this upon an infallible aſſurance received (as you ſay) from Gods Word by the very reading of it. Againſt thoſe who upon another account (different from the infallible authority of the Church, receive Gods Word) I prove, that according to that word of God, the Church is to be heard and believed, as the piller and ground of truth. And for this point I produce as clear Texts as you do for moſt of thoſe points which you hold neceſſary for Salvation. But if you be a Scholler you know that all our Divines in their Treatiſes of faith, put this very queſtion which you here put *Why do you believe the church?* and not one of them anſwereth as you here make us anſwer; that ſo you might the better impugn us with the applauſe of the deceived multitude. Sir, when we deal with thoſe who have not admitted the Scriptures as infallible, we do not prove them to be ſo by the Authority of the Church, without firſt proving to them this Authority of the Church (and that independently of Scripture) to be infallible. Now if you aske me how I doe this? then indeed you ſpeak to the purpoſe, though not to your purpoſe which was to ſhut me up in a Circle into which you ſee, I never ſet foot.

32. Now if you will still be earnest to know why I do believe this Church to be infallible, I answer, that to give full satisfaction against all that a caviller can say, requireth a Treatise longer then this whole Treatise. What I have said is sufficient to avoid all Circle, when withal I shall have told you that we proceed as securely and groundedly in the reasons for which we believe, the Church to have received from God, Commission to teach us those infallible Verities, which she hath received from God, with infallible certainty, as many millions have proceeded in their imbracing the true Faith, whose proceedings no man can condemn. I pray, why did the Jewes believe their Prophets to have had Commission from God to deliver his Word infallibly to them by word of mouth, and by writing? Surely as they most prudently believed what the Prophets taught them by word of mouth to be infallibly true, because spoken by those, whom God gave Commission to say what they said; so they most prudently believed what the same men did deliver to them by their writings as Gods Word, because written by those, whom God gave Commission unto to write what they writ. The credit and belief given as well to their writings, as to their words unwritten, was at last found prudently accepted upon the Motives, upon which they accepted their Commissions as given by God for their infallible instruction. All were moved prudently to accept of this their Commission, because God did own it for his by several Miracles, or other most apparent proofs, testifying to the people the infallible Commission which those Prophets, and Scripture writers had, to teach them by words, or writing, or both. Their wits then were induced to accept of this their Commission as truly given by God, moved thereunto by such prudent Motives, that it had been a high act of imprudence (which in point of salvation is damnable) to have disbelieved them; for example, they did either see such apparent Miracles, or such notorious force of Doctrine,

ctrine, working visibly so strange changes of manners, and in so many before so vitious, to a life very Vertuous, and sometimes vertuous in a stupidious degree. The writers of the New Testament had these divine attentions yet more abundantly (though the others cannot be denied sufficient) whence as from their only words not yet written many thousands received their faith, because they first prudently were induced by these Motives to acknowledge them to have had a true Commission from God, to say to us in his Name all that they said, and then because they acknowledged this Commission to be from God, they believed infallibly all what they said, because they said it with Commission from God to say it. So by their words now written by them in the Scriptures, which they delivered unto them, many thousands received their Faith, because first prudently they were induced by these Motives to acknowledge these writers to have had a true Commission from God to write what they did write in his Name, and then because they acknowledged this Commission to have been from God, they did believe infallibly all that they did write, because they did write it with Commission from God. Thus you see upon what assurance, those who first received the Scriptures did receive them for Gods VVord. The Apostles gave their writings to the prime Prelates and Pastors of the Church, assuring them in Gods Name that these writings were Gods VVord. These Pastors and Prelates preached to the people that they should admit of these writings as Gods true VVord. VVhat they preached was believed with an infallible assent upon the authoritie of the prime Pastours of the Church. They were prudently induced to give an infallible assent to their authority by these strong Motives by which they had demonstrated themselves to have Commission from God to teach his Doctrine, both by word and writing. Thus was the first Age assured of Gods Word by the Oral Tradition of the first Pastors of the Church,

assuring them also *that the Spirit of truth would abide with the Church, teaching her all truth*, and that *they were to hear the Church under pain of being accounted Publicans and Heathens* and that she should be unto them *as the piller and ground of truth*: for as they did write, so doubtless they did teach these things. These first Christians then received this doctrine with an assent as infallible as they received the Scriptures. And so all then believed and all taught their Successors to believe the Church to have such infallible assistance of the Holy Ghost, that in all doubts arising about faith they were to submit unto her, as to one having Commission from God to declare all such matters. The second Age by so universal, so full, so manifest a tradition, was most prudently induced to acknowledge the church to have such a Commission from God, and so they believe the Church for this divine authority given her. Now there is nothing which can make any thing more prudently credible then universal tradition; A miracle to confirm that there is such a City as *London*, though in it self it were a surer motive, would not work so undoubted a belief in the minds of those who never did see *London*, as universal tradition worketh. And yet this tradition is but one of the motives which induceth us to acknowledge the Church to have received Commission to declare with infallible authority the Verities received from the Apostles, and consequently her declarations to be admitted with infallible assent for her authority. But I must needs note that this motive of tradition alone, did serve to make all for the first 2000 yeares and more, give an infallible assent to their Church see Ch. 4. Number 11. yet here I intreat you to mark how they resolved their faith then. Why did they believe then that the Soul was immortal. Because God said so by his Church, having Commission to teach us all we are to believe. Why believed they that this Church had Commission to teach them as Authorized with due infallibilitie? Because

cauſe the ſame Church told them ſo. Why did they believe this? Becauſe they would do ſo, And they would do ſo becauſe, it had been meere folly not to accept of this Churches Commiſſion to teach them infallibly all truths, which Commiſsion they knew by tradition to have been ever accepted as divine by all good people; ſo we &c. I will adde one Motive more.

33. Miracles are called *a Teſtimony greater then Iohn the Baptiſt.* Chriſt himſelf ſaid, *If you will not believe me, believe my Works?* By this great teſtimony of Miracles God hath often owned the doctrine of the Romane Church, even as it is in this our dayes. For he knoweth but litle of the world, who doth not know the vaſt extent of thoſe Provinces and Kingdomes which in this laſt Age the Preachers of the *Roman* Faith have added to their Faith by this Teſtimony of God, *by Signes and Wonders, and divers Miracles*, Hebrewes 2. 4. And here moſt Viſibly, *Our Lord ever working withall, and confirming their words by Signes and Miracles.* It appeareth alſo by the Hiſtory of *Bede* and the plain confeſſion of your learned *Magdeburgians*, that the faith brought into our *England* by St. *Auſtin*, was the ſame faith which you aboliſhed by your Reformation, as you call it. And yet again it appeareth by *Bede* and St. *Gregory* his Epiſtles, that wonderful were the miracles which St. *Auſtin* wrought in Confirmation of the faith preached, in ſo much that St. *Gregory* thought it neceſſary to admoniſh him of conteining himſelf in humility, leſt the working of ſo many miracles ſhould puff him up. Theſe Preachers preached the Doctrine of our Church. God confirmed their Doctrine by miracles. Therefore the doctrine of our Church was confirmed by miracles. And it may for this motive be imbrac'd with as infallible an aſſent as the doctrine of the Prophets and Apoſt. Yea, there have bin many miracles wrought to teſtifie many & very many of thoſe points in particular in w^ch^ wediffer frō you. As you may ſee ſhew'd by *Brierly* only by looking in his *Index.* 5. *miracles*, but ſee him particularly, *T.* 2. *C.* 3 *Tr.* 8. 7. *Subdivis.*

And *Tr.* 1. *s.* 5. There you shall see how solidly grounded these Miracles are, against which you can object nothing which is not objected with equal probabilitie by Heathens against the Miracles of the Prophets, and by Jewes against those of the Apostles. Tell me then if these two motives (though there be yet many others) be not as powerful inducements to move us to acknowledge that God hath given his Church infallible authoritie to teach us faithfully which she received from him, as were those motives for which the Jewes did prudently believe that the Scripture given them by *David*, by *Salomon*, by *Nahum*, by *Amos* and others, were written with infallible authoritie by them, having Commission from God to write what they did write. We then believe the Church to have such a Commission with as good security as they acknowledged this Commission in those Scripture writers. Whereas the ground upon which you believe Scripture is thought to be fooliſh and Chimerical by some of your best Writers.

34. Yet to shew further how unsecurely the greater part of your Religion did ground their faith, I did add this argument that the true Original Scriptures were written in languages not knowne to one among ten thousand, if we speake of a perfect knowledge. Others must trust the Translations of private men, and believe them rather then the Translations used by the Church in general Councils Is it not cleere that the Authority of such Translations is far greater, and far more to be judged to agree with the true Original, then any of your private Mens Translations? You your selfe confesse that Translations are only so far Gods word as they agree with the originals, whence I infer that no body in your opinion can believe any point upon the authority of any Translations, until he be assured that such a point agreeth with the true Hebrew or true Greek Original; How disappointed then be most of your Religion, especially your women, who so fiercely fly upon us for believing the Church, whilest they themselves must

muſt either believe nothing (for they cannot believe any thing upon the credit of the Engliſh Tranſlation, until they know how exactly it agreeth with the true Greek, or true Hebrew Original, which is wholy impoſſible for them) or elſe they muſt merely take upon truſt the moſt fallible Tranſlations for the infallible Original, and truſt rather in this moſt important point the learning, and fair dealing of thoſe private Miniſters (deeply intereſſed in this cauſe) then truſt the greateſt authority upon earth, which is a general Council having ſo ſtrong promiſe of the aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt. I intreat you here to ſee Chapter 4. Numb. 9.

35. Again, I pray tell me how you learned Miniſters who have ſo full knowledge of theſe languages as to Tranſlate, and upon your own knowledge to judge of true Tranſlations made by others, of you it is that I ask how you come to know (and know ſo ſufficiently as to ground an infallible aſſent in your ſelves and others) when your Tranſlations agree with the true Original? For you have now confeſſed *that Tranſlations are only ſo far Gods word as they agree with the Originals.* And you muſt mean the true Originals or elſe you ſay nothing, for agreeing with falſe or doubtful Originals will not make them Gods undoubted Word. Tell me, (I ſay it again, and again) how do you know which be the true, and undoubtedly true Originals? and upon what ſecure ground do you know it? The true Originals be either Hebrew or Greek; As for the Hebrew, all muſt know that the ancient Hebrew Copies were all written without points, that is, in full ſubſtance without Vowels. Now they be the Vowels which make or marre the word and ſenſe; for a Vowell addeth the ſoul and the ſound to the conſonants, and maketh them ſignify moſt different things. For example, for *a Ball* write only *b ll* to which conſonants if you adde an (*a*) it is *Ball*, adde an (*e*) it is *Bell*, adde an (*u*) and it is a *Bull*, So that, great confuſion muſt needs follow if the true

true points, that is, the true Vowells were not put to the ſame Conſonants. Well now again, all muſt know that a good while after the time of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, the Jewiſh Rabbies, under pretence of avoyding the miſtakes which might happen in the leſſe skilfull in the Hebrew tongue (which then was almoſt worn out) did take the old Hebrew Teſtament, and put the points, that is the Vowels unto it, ſo that the old Teſtament we now uſe came from theſe Jewiſh hands. Tell me then how know you infallibly whither theſe perfidious Jewes had skill, and honeſty enough to deliver to us their Copies with the true points and Vowells; and yet all depends on this. The conſonants alone will not aſſure us in theſe unskilful, and ſo remote ages. For the leaſt change in appoint maketh moſt contrary things to be all one, for no Man can tell (eſpecially infallibly) whether theſe words *an Angel had a bill in his hand* ſhould be read thus, *an Angel had a Ball, in his hand or a Bell, or a Bill, or a Bull.* Put a falſe Vowel and it is all one. *To taſt cheeſe and to toſt cheeſe*, all one; *to be fatt and to be fitt, to increaſe in Grace* and *to increaſe in Greece*, all one; to eat *a bitter fig and to eat a better fig. A pot ful of butter*, and *a Pit ful of Batter*, will be the ſame. Hence you ſee the ſmall infallibility you have of the poſſeſsing the true undoubted Originall Hebrew old Teſtament. As for the new teſtament, Saint *Mathewes* Goſpel was Originally written in Hebrew, and that Originall is quite loſt. Now the other Greek Originalls which we have, have a ſtupendious Variety, He who found the word Infallible ſo unfortunate to him (which you object to me) telleth of his own knowledge a ſtory moſt unfortunate to you and yours (which I have alſo heard by an other way,) His words are theſe. *In my hearing Biſhop* Ulſher, *profeſſed, that whereas he had of many yeares before a deſire to publiſh the Teſtament in Greek with Various Lections and Annotations, and for that purpoſe had uſed great diligence and ſpent much money to furniſh himſelf with*

*with Manuſcripts, yet in concluſion he was forced to deſiſt utterly leaſt, if he ſhould ingenuouſly have noted all the ſeveral differences of readings which himſelf had collected, the incredible multitude of them almoſt in every verſe, ſhould rather have made Man Atheiſtically then ſatisfy them in the true reading of any particular paſſage. An evident ſigne that the Governours of the Church did not onely rely upon what was in writing.* So Creſſy Exomol. C. 8. N. 3. Now if another in *Spain*, another at *Conſtantinople* or other in ſome remote part from theſe had beſtowed the like or greater expences, and induſtries in procuring Varieties of Manuſcripts, it is moſt probable they might have in theſe places found in every one of them, as great variety of lections, which multitude of Lections *Uſher* alone found to *be incredible almoſt in every verſe*. The Manuſcripts which were before all printing being ſo exceeding different, what aſſurance have thoſe who did firſt print ſuch, or ſuch a Manuſcript, rather then a hundred Manuſcripts (different from that which they printed) that the Manuſcript, which was the true undoubted Copy of the true undoubted Originall was printed by them, and publiſhed to the world, which now contents it ſelf with printed Copies onely, and not one among twenty thouſand hath recourſe to any old written Manuſcripts; or if they have recourſe to any ſuch Manuſcript, or Manuſcripts, yet they are ſo wonderfull farre from having any full aſſurance, that ſuch Manuſcripts be the true undoubted Copies, of the true undoubted Original; that they approach not one inch nearer the Aſſurance of the Truth, by having Recourſe to ſuch Manuſcripts. And here it is that I may farre fitter uſe theſe your owne words (uſed in another place againſt me;) *Alas Sir, At what a loſſe are you and yours in this grand and capital and comprehenſive controverſie, which affords me liberty to think, that which is intricated with ſo many unſpeakable difficulties and moſt manifeſt uncertainties, is not that manifeſt ground of certainty,*

*and infallible certainty, by which fools cannot erre; for what else can a Collier have infallibly to guide him through all these Labyrinths,* whose windings are made more unextricable by lying so far from the least glimpse of any Light: For as you say *Translations are only so farre Gods Word as they agree with the Originals*, that is with such Originals as are the true and undoubted Copies of the true and undoubted Original. But (say I) it is impossible for any man living (who accounteth the judgment of the Church to be fallible) to know infallibly, which Translation agree with the true undoubted Originals, and which not, because it is impossible for him to know which be the true undoubted Originals, and which not. Therefore it is impossible for any man living (who accounteth the judgement of the Church to be fallible) to know which Translations be the word of God and which not. You then have neither infallible assurance of translation, nor of Original, and consequently you have no assurance of any part of Scripture to be God assured Word. And yet all the assurance of your faith is built upon this, of which you have no assurance at all. For you have no assurance of either *Translation or Original* or *Interpretation* of any one book or how many or which books make up the whole Canon.

36. As for our assurance of the Word of God it dependeth not upon these inextricable uncertainties. If those who received the first true Original Coppy did upon good ground receive it, relying upon the authority of those who did give it unto them, as an authority infallible; we upon no lesse good ground receive (as authentical and secure from error, both in faith and manners) our Vulgar Translation, which we receive upon the infallible authority of the Church, An infallibity as well grounded as theirs who received first the true Original Scriptures, as I proved Numbers 32.33. But of this infallibility I am to treat at large Chapter 4. If *Isidor Clarius* in any one title importing faith or manners, differs from what

we

we receive, upon this infallible authority, we have nothing to do with him; what you object against us for the different editions of *Sixtus* and *Clement* hath bin answered by many, and very fully by that famous book called *Charitie Maintained*, written against *Potter*, see it Part. 2. Cap. 6. Numb. 3. Where, by authentical Testimonies of persons beyond all exceptions, is shewed that the decree of *Sixtus* about his edition, was never promulgated, and that he himselfe, had declared diverse things to have crept in which needed a second review, and that the whole work should be re-examined though he could never do it, being prevented by death. The very self same is told you distinctly in the Preface to our Vulgar Edition: but I cited the former book, because of his severall proofs, and because *Chillingworth* (who with so much applause of many) answered this book, doth not return one word to disprove his Adversaries most satisfactory answer. All your other arguments end in the biting of a flea.

37. Next you object two places of S. *Austin*. But Sir you have given me leave to have no more to do with the Fathers Authority. Councils you also labour to discredit in the highest degree, for you make them like false witnesses, in matters concerning the salvation of infinite people, to betray their own falsity, in affirming things directly contradictory. You must not say, but prove by S. *Austin*, and other good Authors, that two lawful Councils, lawfully approved, have taught contrary opinions in matter of Faith, otherwise you only deceive the people, which knoweth not which Councils were lawful, which not. Would you make us believe S. *Austin* thought the Council of *Ariminum* a lawful Council? Do you your self hold it so? Did not he know it was not so as wel as you. After all then you cannot shew which is your prime Principle. That, take away the infallibility of the Church, you can find infallible means by Scripture only to decide all Controversies; for by Scripture only it is a plain impossi-

bility to decide which Scriptures be the true word of God, which not, As also which be corrupted which be not, and which be the true original Copies of the true Books, which be not, This is a true convincing argument.

38. Another argument is, that there be many Controversies (and may be yet many more,) the decision of which is necessary to Salvation, and yet they cannot be decided by Scripture only, and consequently some other infallible Judge (to wit the Church) is necessary for the infallible decision of these points. Your second answer still is, that the decisions of all such Controversies are plainly set down in Scripture, which I have at large shewed in the beginning of this Chapter, to be false, and now I go to shew it further by specifying divers of these Controversies in particular.

Of my 8th. Number.

39. The first of these Controversies is about the necessity of not working upon the Sunday. You dare not say that he shall be saved who doth weekly work, and resolveth to work upon the Sunday, without any necessity. You must then affirm, that to abstain from working upon that day, is a point necessary to Salvation. Now I ask where this necessary point is plainly set down in Scripture? And I presse you to give me, as clear Texts to prove this, as I cited at large to prove that we must not now work on Saturdayes. You are to shew Texts in which this point is plainly set down, for these Texts I called. In place of these Texts you bring your own discourses. Now according to your own opinion that Councils, though general, in their discourses out of Scripture, may be forsaken by him who judgeth such discourses nothing so well grounded in the Text, as the discourses for the contrary opinion are grounded in other Texts. Hence you must needs give the Sabbatharians, leave to reject these your discourses with far greater reason then you reject the discourses of Councils. Whence then shall we have an infallible decision of this Controversie. Your own Doctor

*Taylor*

*Tayler* in his defence of Episcopacy Pag. 100. writeth thus, *For that* (keeping of the Sunday) *in the New Testament we have no precept and nothing but the example of the primitive Disciples. At Geneva they were once upon changing Sundayes Feast into Thursday, to have shown their Christian Liberty.* If this were plainly set down in Scripture would not these your illuminated Brethren see it as well as you. And you so often called upon for a plain Text, instead of bringing infallible Texts, bring nothing but a discourse of your own, very fallible, and proving nothing but a possibility of such a change. To the far stronger Text for still keeping the Sabboth, you say not a word. My argument then as yet hath nothing like a satisfactory answer returned unto it.

Of my 9th. Number.

40. The second Controversie which I said could not clearly be decided by Scripture is about our lawful eating or not eating of that which is strangled, clearly forbidden *Act.* 15. But because there may be some reasons alledged why this precept now obligeth no longer (though I might insist that we seek for Texts and not for reasons) I presse this argument no further, having so great plenty of far more pressing arguments.

Of my 10th. Number.

41. A third Controversie not clearly decided for you by Scripture, I briefly touched concerning the holding the King, Head of the Church, whom you according to plain Scripture determine to be still the Head of the Church, though others hold it very far from being plain Scripture. This Controversie must needs highly import, that all the Members may have an assured knowledge of the Head, by whom they are to be governed. This point was before evident Scripture, now it is no longer evident Scripture. Your answer is first. *What is infallibly decided by Scripture, will ever be so, although we do not always find it.* Sir, if you mean what is infallibly decided by evident Scripture, is not alwayes to be found, it is manifestly false. This being against the very Na-

ture.

nature of that which is evident, when it is ſuppoſed to ſtand laid wide open before our eyes in the ſame words which made it before evident Scripture. You add, [Secondly, *That you doe not ſay every point is Infallibly decided by Scripture, becauſe it is not at all decided.*] Sir, Is not this a neceſſary point, and be not theſe your own words? *All things neceſſary to ſalvation are plainly ſet down in Scripture*, and again, *What is not plainly ſet down in Scripture is hereby underſtood not to be neceſſary*. Grant theſe Principles falſe and the cauſe is mine. If they be true, this point being neceſſary, muſt alſo be plainly decided by clear Scripture. And when you aske me *whether it be determined in Scripture that the Pope is head of the Church*? You forget that we do not teach (as you do) that all points neceſſary are plainly ſet down in Scripture, but we teach the quite contrary. You that hold that on the one ſide the King is head of the Church, and on the other ſide that all points neceſſary to Salvation be plainly ſet down in Scripture, you (I ſay) muſt ſhew me plain Scripture for what you ſay in a point ſo neceſſary, as it is for ſo many millions to know ſo capital a point as their head is. If for ſuch a point as this (to which ſo many were obliged to ſwear) you have no plain Text of Scripture, I pray tell us no more hereafter, that all neceſſary points are plainly ſet down in Scripture. I adde that either you muſt be far from having any evident Text for this point in Scripture, or your moſt illuminated *Calvin* could not ſee that which was evident, for he writing on the 7th of *Amos*, ſaith of our *Engliſh* Church. *They were blaſphemous when they called him* (Henry the Eighth) *chief Head of the Church under Chriſt.*

Of my 11th. and 12th. Num b.

42. A fourth Controverſie not decidable by any clear Text of Scripture is, *which be the true Books of Scripture, which not*, about which we ſtill differ mainly. And it is evident no Text can decide this Controverſie: Of this in general I have ſpoken fully. That for which I repeated it over again is to preſſe particularly the impoſſibility that

here

there is to prove by Scripture (against the *Manichæans*) that St. *Matthew* his Gospel is the true uncorrupted Word of God. That it is impossible to know it to be Saint *Matthewes* Gospel you your self confess, holding it in plain termes a point of no necessitie to believe: this; yet sure I am that your learned Brethren in their conference at *Ratisbone*, dared not to deny, that it was an Article of faith to believe Saint *Matthewes* Gospel to have been written by Saint *Matthew*. And I believe your own Brethren will be scandalized at this your Opinion. But before you can goe forward, to shew it impossible to prove by Scripture that Saint *Matthewes* Gospel is the same uncorrupted Word of God, I am necessitated to Answer what ye Object by the way.

43. You say then first, *That if the Church were infallible Judge of all Canonical Books, yet would it not follow from hence, that it should be infallible Iudge in all points of Faith, unless causally, for we might suppose more assurance to the Church in this particular then in other cases.* Is it so good Sir? Can you suppose a point, upon which all depends, to be held by all as infallibly true, without shewing such a point to be clearly contained in Scripture? Why this spoils all. Your onely shift, to avoid the necessitie of an infallible Church, is still to say, that all necessary points are plainly set down in Scripture, and that if any point be not plainly set down in Scripture, it hereby appeareth not to be necessary. And will you now suppose this most necessary point of all points, which is not clearly set down in Scripture, to be admitted with infallible assent upon the only authority of the Church? That we are universally to hear the Church hath many pregnant places in Scripture, as I shall shew at large, C 4. But that we are to learn this one point, and none but this onely, from the infallible authority of the Church, hath no colour nor shadow of Scripture, or any thing like Scripture. You must therefore ground this your answer, not upon Scripture, but upon

Reason.

Reason. Now the Reason upon which you reject the Church from being an infallible Judge of Controversies, is because there is no necessity of such a Judge, since the whole Canon of the Scripture was finished. And for this onely Reason (without any Text) you put the Churches infallibility to expire and give up the Ghost at the finishing the Canon of the Scripture. Now if the reason for which you discard the Churches infallibility, in other points, be this, that other points are cleared sufficiently by Scripture: Then there can be no other prudent reason for which you in this one point may more assuredly suppose the Church to be infallible, but that this one point cannot be sufficiently cleared by Scripture; and that therefore only there is a greater necessity to have recourse to the infallible authority of a Church, undoubtedly infallible in this prime point, which point causally brings forth all others. This discourse being evidently deduced out of your own prime principles, I pray mark two things which I am going to say. The first is, that this your answer overthroweth utterly that main ground of yours, *That all points necessary are plainly set down in Scripture.* For no point is more necessary then this without which there is no coming to the beliefe of any thing in Scripture, and yet this point is neither plainly nor obscurely set down in Scripture, unles it be where we are Universally sent to the Church for learning other points as well as this.

44. The Second thing I would have marked is, that you utterly overthrow that principle which is the groundwork of your faith. For if there be a greater necessity to acknowledge the infallibility of a Church, for as much as concerns this one point in particular, because this one point in particular is lesse clear in Scripture then any other necessary point; that grand principle of yours evidently appeareth false (though you speak it for your second answer so close after the other) *That the Canonical books bear witnesse of themselves, they carry their own light, which*

we

*we may see them by this, as we see the Sunne by its own Light.* How is it possible that there should be a greater necessity on the one side to have recourse to the Churches Authority as infallible in this particular point, because it can lesse be cleared by Scripture then other points, and yet on the other side, this point of all other points, hath this particular privilege to be so manifest, *That it beareth witnesse of its own selfe, that it carrieth its own Light with it*, and such a conspicuous Light, *that we may see this Verity by it, as we see the Sun by its own Light.* But how vain this Ground is, upon which all must be supported, I have shewed largely from the 26. Number unto the 30th. As for your *Dilemma*, I have broken the *Horns* of it, Numb. 31. 32, 33. And what you further say about Saint *Hierom* is answered, Numb. 27. And as for *Bellarmine*, if you had cited him in the very self same Treatise in that place where he speaketh of the *Machabees* in particular, (to wit, *Lib.* 1. *Cap.* 1. *fine*) He would have answered your Argument just as I answer it in that place. And note I pray by the way what you find, to wit, That the Fathers of the Council of *Carthage* acknowledged the *Machabees* for true Scripture. Now if these Fathers were of your Religion, then you must make them agree with you in your prime Principles upon which you receive all Scriptures as Gods infallible Word, because by their own light every Book is seen to be Canonical, as we see the Sun by its own light; Therefore according to you, these Fathers, did, by this light se these books of the *Mache.* to be canonical, by a light sufficient to an infallibility. This must therfore be infallibly true, & yet your *Church* denies it; nay you must say you cānot se this light you say is so clear.

45. And I pray now aske me (as you doe) *How I see Light?* I Answer, with such eyes as other men have, Who can see it as well as I. It hath litale judiciousnesse in it, (pardon your owne words) to say that a thing is as visible as Light, and as apparent as the

first principles, and yet even at the very self same time to say the most irradiated understandings of Saint *Austin*, of *the whole Council of Carthage*, of Saint *Hierom*, *of Luther*, *of their own selves*; see by this Light, and by this prime Principle quite opposite Verities. But of this see yet more in my 27. Number. As for the infallibility of the Church, I do not prove it first by Scripture, but as I have told you Numb. 30. 31, 32, 33. About believing Saint *Matthews* Gospel to have been written by him; I have said enough, Numb. 42.

46. At last I have forced a passage to my intended argument about Saint *Matthews* Gospel, which I boldly say cannot possibly, by your principles, ever come to be believed, with an infallible assent to be Gods true uncorrupted Word. The *Marcionists*, the *Cerdonists*, the *Manichees*, do deny (and others may come to deny) the Gospel of Saint *Matthew* to be Gods true Word. This Controversie (as all others) according to you must be ended by Scripture onely. But that is impossible, for the Scripture, doth not so much as touch in one word this Controversie. Therefore it is false that the Scripture doth plainly set down all necessary points, without you will say it is not necessary to believe Saint *Matthews* Gospel. Here you cannot fly to a Light as clear as the Sun shewing this Verity, for your own doctrine is that *Translations are onely so far Gods Word as they agree with the Originals*, as we have seen, Numb. 34. 35. But we have onely Translations of Saint *Matthews* Gospel, and no Original copy at all; Therefore it is impossible for us (in your Principles) to know how far Saint *Matthews* Gospel is Gods Word, because it is impossible to know how far it agreeth with the Originals. Perhaps whole Chapters are left out, perhaps divers things here and there put in, or altered, for it is uncertain who the Translator was, and of what skill, or honesty. The Church you confess (in your first answer) doth not certifie us; *Ergo*, this Answer is no Answer.

For

For yet you doe not shew, how we are certified of this truth, That this is the true uncorrupted Gospel of Saint *Matthew*. Secondly, you would tax us for saying that no one of the Antients conceived this Gospel to be written in Greek. You might easily understand our meaning to be that no one of them can be produced as a witnesse, so much as weakly moving us to believe this. For their Testimony (who did not write at all, or whose writings have perished) is no kind of Testimony, no more then if there never had been such men. You adde that it is not certainly true that there is not a copy of the Hebrew Gospel extant in all the world. Good Sir, in what year of our Lord, was it that I did say, *that this was certainly true?* Did not I say so this very last year, which was above twelve hundred years since Saint *Ferom's* time. If there were one Hebrew copy then, what is that to our purpose now? Can we go and confer our Translations of Saint *Matthew*, and see how far they agree with that Original copy which St. *Ferom* in his dayes did see in one only place of the world? Shew me so much as one Hebrew copy now extant in the whole world of sufficient credit to ground an infallible assent. If after more then a thousand years loss of all Original copies, *Munster*, or any other private man, obtrude us an Hebrew Original, which hath lain all this while, God knowes where; by what Evidence will that appear Gods infallible and uncorrupted Word: All your shifts will not here help you.

48. You would shift first by asking how the Latine Interpretation came to be Authentique. I Answer, Because it was accepted for authentique, and thus declared to be so by the Church, which Church when she admitted it, was fully satisfied that it agreed with the Original. And this she knew by Tradition from the Church of former Ages. This Tradition doth not certifie you because you hold it fallible. And therefore most certainly I certifie you that you will never believe Saint *Matthewes* Go-

ſpel with an infallible aſſent until you believe the Church infallible in her traditions. Your ſecond ſhift is, this *Goſpel might poſſibly at the firſt be written in Greek.* Good Sir, tell me whether onely poſſibilities grounded upon conjectures be ſufficient to ground an infallible aſſent. And here give me leave by the way to ſhew you once more the evident unevidence which is in that light by which you ſee Saint *Lukes* Goſpel (for example) to be Gods true word, and ſo of all other Scriptures. The Greek Copy of Saint *Luke*, you ſee as evidently as the Sun to be Gods true Word by reading of it, and yet this great Evidence is ſo little different from that Evident inevidence, (which you call a Poſſibilitie) that Saint *Matthews* Greek Copy is Gods true and uncorrupted Word, that you cannot ſee (with your irradiated underſtanding) whether this inevidence be not to the full as good as that Evidence, and that it may not as well ground an infallible aſſent as that. Again, how come you to hold it a meer *Poſſibility* that Saint *Matthews* Goſpel was written in Greek; for if the Greek Text of Saint *Matthew* be as truly Original as that of Saint *Luke*, your irradiated underſtanding muſt needs by its Light, ſee it to be Gods Word, as well as you ſee the Sun by its Light; why then do you venture no further then to eſteem it *a poſſibilitie*. Is it a meer poſſibilitie that St. *Lukes* Goſpel is Gods uncorrupted word? Now let us ſee how ſlender your Conjecture is (though I confeſs it to be better in my judgement, then the light manifeſting to you infallibly the truth of Saint *Lukes* Goſpel:) Let us ſee, I ſay how ſlender your Conjecture is to prove *that poſſibly Saint Matthewes Goſpel might be written firſt in Greek, becauſe the Greek Copy interpreteth the Hebrew word, Emmanuel*; which if it were written in Hebrew, needed not any interpretation. A pittiful weak Conjecture. And this Dart is no ſooner raiſed above your head with weak hand, but it falls with a ſtrong hand, upon your head again. The Greek Copy tranſlateth Hebrew words, therefore (ſay

(ſay you) it is no Tranſlation, but it is an Original. Sir, it is manifeſt that Tranſlations of Scripture uſually tell us the Hebrew words firſt, and then the Tranſlation of it. So *Geneſis* 31. 48. *Galaad, id eſt, tumulus teſtis. Galaad,* that is, the witneſſe heap. And *Gen.* 35. 18. *Benoni, id eſt, filius doloris mei. Benjamin, id filius dextræ.* And *Exod.* 12. *Phaſe, id eſt, tranſitus.* And *Exodus* 26. *Manhu, quod ſignificat quid eſt hoc.* By theſe and divers ſuch places you ſee how familiarly Tranſlatours tell you the Hebrew word, and then the Interpretation of it. No prophane mean authoritie would upon ſo ſlight a conjecture as this is, be rejected and contradicted. Much leſſe if he made himſelf an eye-witneſſe of what he ſaid. Yet you reject Saint *Jerom*, though he ſaith he did ſee a copy of the Hebrew Original with his own eyes, and you reject him though *all the Fathers writings extant* ſtand on his ſide, and this upon a moſt ſlender conjecture of your own, which would have made another man more wiſely conjecture the quite contrary, and ſay, *this copy Tranſlateth*, Ergo, *it is a Tranſlation.* Whence it evidently appears how little you care either for the ſingle, or for the unanimous conſent of Eminent Fathers. But this being a point onely to bee tried by the Teſtimony of Antiquitie, your Cauſe is loſt without ſome good Authours can be found for you. Your third ſhift is in place of giving a Solution to make an Objection, asking, *Why our Latine Tranſlation was made Authentique, if the Church had made the Greeke Authentique?*

I Anſwer, that I know of no body who told you, That the Greeke Tranſlation was made Authentique by the Church. Neither Greeke nor Latine can be Authentique but by the Church, becauſe the Hebrew Original being loſt, we cannot know how farre either Greek or Latine Tranſlation agreeth with the Original, but by the infallible Tradition of the Church, you, who

reject this, cannot know possibly how far translations be Gods uncorrupted word, for (as you say) they are only so far Gods uncorrupted Word as they agree with the Original; But you know not how far they agree with the Original. *Ergo* you know not how far they be Gods word. Your fourth shift is to pretend to this knowledge by the Harmony with the other Gospels. Sir If any man intended to make a supposititious Gospel; do you not think he would take care, not to contradict the others. But what harmony can there be found in these many things related by Saint *Matthew*, and not related at all by any others? Yea, one of the greatest difficulties against Saint *Matthews* Gospel is to shew that it exactly agreeth with other Scriptures from the beginning to the ending. And to be the briefer I will onely instance in some places of the beginning and ending omitting all the rest. In the very first Chapter Saint *Matthew* tells us that *Ioram did beget Ozias*; And yet out of the fourth Book of *Kings* (which your Bible is pleased to call the Second Book) it is manifest that *Ioram begat Ochozias* C. 8. And *that Ochozias did beget Ioas*, C. 11. And that *Ioas begat Amasias*, C. 12. and this *Amasias begat Azarias* C. 14. who is called here in Saint *Matthew*, *Ozias*. I ask then how cometh Saint *Matthew* to say *Ioas begat Ozias*, who was born three Generations after him. And being that these three Generations hapned between the time of *David*, and the Captivity of *Babylon*, they beeing added to the other 14 Generations doe make them to be seaventeen. How then is it true which Saint *Matthew* saith verse 17. *that all Generations from David until the carrying away into Babilon are fourteen.* For all these Generations were Seventeen. Again he saith, *there were fourteen Generations from Abraham to David*, and (besides the fourteen now mentioned) that there were *fourteen more Generations from the carrying away into Babylon until* Christ. Count now thrice fourteen Generations, and they in all will make fourty two. But I pray now take your

your fingers, and count all the Generations specified in Saint *Matthew*, and you shall find them to be only fourty one. A wonderful exceeding great difficulty. And this for the beginning. Now towards the end of Saint *Matthew* see the Twenty seven Chapter v. 9. *Then was fulfilled that which was said by the Prophet Jeremy*; Read all the Prophet *Jeremy* and he hath no such matter in him. What Harmony appeareth here? Indeed in the Prophet *Zachary*, (C. 11.) there is in substance what Saint *Matthew* said in his former Chapter about the denial of Christ by Saint *Peter*, how much do Interpreters sweat to reconcile what Saint *Matthew* saith with that which other Evangilists say, which seem to differ in very many circumstances. No less, yea far greater difficulty is it, to make all that Saint *Matthew* saith in his last Chapter concerning some Circumstances of the Resurrection of Christ, as the attentive Reader may easily see. Now I pray tell me if it be not a plain Paradox to say that the agreeing of Saint *Matthew* with other Scriptures is so apparent, that even from hence a man may know his Gospel to be infallibly Gods word, where as the apparent disagreeing bringeth most vast difficulties, as I have shewed. Your fifth and last shift is, *That all the people do fixe their faith upon that which is interpreted and not upon the Interpretation.* If you do so, then for any thing you know, you may fixe your faith upon a Lye: for how know you whether the thing delivered you by the Interpreter be Gods Word, or the Interpreters own word? Especially when we know not who this Interpreter was, how skilful, how faithful, how true a Copy he used? How know you that this translator doth not convey his own phansies in place of Gods Word? Do you know it because your fancy also tells you that this is Gods Word, then thus we may have a double phantasticall assurance, and nothing else. This you are forced to hold sufficient, yet how doth this agree with your owne words, *Translations are only so far Gods Words as they agree with the Originals*, you cannot

cannot reſolve your faith into the Original never propoſed unto you, into the Tranſlation you ſay you do not reſolve it, yet you reſolve it into the written word. What written word is that, which is neither Tranſlation nor Original? This I ask and this you are bound to tell me, being your very main Poſition is that all you believe is reſolv'd in to the written words. If the Illumination of the Spirit can tell you Gods word without any certain aſſured conveighing means, you muſt needs be a prophet, you muſt needs have far more then you will allow to the Church. You muſt needs know which of thoſe ſo many Greek Copies, is the only true one. And by the like illumination of the Spirit any clown neither underſtanding Latine, Greek or Hebrew, will be able infallibly to know which *Engliſh* Tranſlation is Gods true Word. And if you ſay he cannot becauſe he cannot confer it with the Original, he will truly tell you that he can confer it with the Original, as much as you can confer any Tranſlation of S. *Matthew* with the Original, which not being Extant in the whole World can no more be looked upon by you who know Hebrew, then by him. To other Tranſlations you give but humane credit, ſuch as he giveth to the *Engliſh* Tranſlation.

Now after you have given to every one of your own any Illumination of Spirit ſufficient to know infallibly Gods Word without having any better conveyance, then a humane Tranſlation, you (very judiciouſly) deny any ſuch Illumination to the Church, becauſe ſhe erred in Tranſlating *Ipſa* for *ipſum*. It is clear ſome Hebrew copies may moſt exactly be Tranſlated *Ipſum*, how know you the Church followed the falſe Hebrew Copy? How many moſt grave and moſt ancient Fathers have alſo read *Ipſa*. And it was a loud lye of *Kemnitius* to ſay the contrary. See the *Doway Annotations* Gen. 3. V. 15. And *Bellarm. l. 2. de verbo Dei, Cap.* 12. And if you ask why the Greek was not made infallible by the Church as well as the Latine? I anſwer, we have her declaration that the Latin Vulgar

is

is Authentique, and not deficient in any point concerning faith or manners; when the Church shall declare as much of the Greek, that may then be believed Authentique; if both be Authentique upon the Churches Declaration, yet you, who believe her Declarations to be fallible, will still have a onely fallible ground for that assent which you give to Saint *Matthews* Gospel. So that all your shifts fail you in this important point of Faith towards a whole Gospel. All that you prove concerning other points debated between us out of Holy Fathers, since they find so little credit with you) after their Authoritie is demonstrated to stand for such or such a point) are not to be insisted upon until you esteem them more.

Of my 13th. Number.

49. I come then to what you say to my 13. Number, where I Object *Luthers* not seeing the Apocalyps and the Epistle of Saint *James* to be Canonical by their own light. Your first answer is, *That a Negative Argument from one is not cogent, for it followeth not he did not see, therefore he could not see it?* Sir, in our case a Negative Argument is a strong proof, and as strong an one as this. *I doe not see (endeavouring to see, and having good eyes wide open) a light as visible by its light, as the Sun by his light*: Ergo, *there is no such light standing before me.* You will grant *Luthers* Eyes as good as your own, his Understanding as Irradiated as your own; the *Apocalyps* stood before his eyes as clearly as yours, what should hinder him from seeing it, and make you see it? The light is the same, the Proposition of it the same, your eyes or understanding no better, nor more assisted. Secondly, you answer that *hence we see you do not follow him in all things blindly.* Sir, the Question is here, who is blind, and truly blind. For you say that a light, no lesse visible by it self then the Sun, is, stands before both your eyes in the reading of the *Apocal.* and yet the one believeth as truly as he believeth any thing that he seeth this light, the other will venture his salvation that he seeth it not, for, in the same book of *Apocalyps* last Chap. verse 1. it is

ſaid. *If any man ſhall take away from the words of this Prophetie, God ſhall take away his part out of the Book of Life.* *Luther* took all the book away; you hold it all Scripture, and yet him a Saint. You goe on, and adde *that the Apocalyps and other Books alſo have been doubted of.* But do you not mark the more doubt there hath been of them, the more evident it is that they moſt ungroundedly be affirmed by you *to carry their own light by which they may be ſeen, as we ſee the Sun by his own light.* Again, being you neither agree with us in the Canon of the Scripture, nor with your own Brethren, what reaſon have you to obtrude a Canon of your own coyning to us for Judge of all Controverſies, you not agreeing nor knowing how many books make up the true Canon, and all agreeing that divers books of the true Canon be quite loſt? Where ſhall we find this our Judge? Among us (after the Church Delaration was notified concerning the receiving of any book for Canonical) you will never find it doubted of by any true Catholiques. You are miſtaken, if you think Saint *Ferom* held the *Machabees* not to be Canonical after the definition of the Council of *Carthage.* It was before that Council that he writ what he writ. Concerning the reſt you adde out of Saint *Auſtin*, I would ſay more if you eſteemed the Fathers more, what you add after that, hath already been anſwered.

Of my 14th. Number.

50. In my 14. Num. for a further proof that the Scripture alone cannot decide all controverſies, I did and do ſtill inſiſt upon this argument, that almoſt all Controverſies do ariſe about the true ſenſe of ſuch or ſuch a Text in Scripture. The ſenſe is the kernel, the life, the Soul of the text; miſſe in this, miſſe in all. And yet about this ſenſe greateſt wits vaſtly differ in many points neceſſary to Salvation, and conſequently many miſſe the true ſenſe to their eternall damnation. This book of the Scripture, by it ſelf alone could never yet end theſe differences; Therefore if God had left us no other

ther means to end our differences, but this Book, about the true understanding of which all our differences arise, he should have no better provided for our unity (even in points necessary to Salvation) then that Law-maker, who should leave his Common-wealth a Book of Laws to end all their Controversies in Law, about the meaning of which Book, he knew all the cheifest Controversies would still arise. This is indeed a repetition of what I said, but it is a repetition of what you have not yet answered. For against your first answer it is apparent that there is not only a necessity of a judge different from Scripture, to declare unto us, which books be the true and uncorrupted word of God; but there is also a main necessity of such a judge to know the undoubted meaning of Gods undoubted Word, about which there be far more controversies in points necessary to Salvation. And though, in your second answer, you tell us, that all points necessary to Salvation are plainly set down in Scripture, yet I have plainly proved the contrary Chap. 3 Num. 200. And my discourse (Contrary to your 3. Answer) is affectual, for in points necessary to Salvation, to be believed with divine faith, we must have an infallible authority to rely on, for that faith, which relieth upon a fallible authority, cannot be an infallible assent. And again if we have not full security of this infallible authority, we cannot assent unto it with an assent infallible, to which we being obliged by God, God also must have furnished us of full security to know this authority to be infallible, as I have shewed him to do. And yet again, that this infallible authority, so well secured is invested in the Church appeareth sufficiently by this, that the Scriptures not assisting us in the infallible knowledge of their own true sense, in points necessary to be believed with infallible faith, we must be assisted to this infallible knowledge by som other infallible means (for fallible will not do the deed.) No other infallible means can, with any shadow of probability, be said given

unto us, but the infallible authority of the Church. Therefore her authority muſt be infallible, as ſhall at large be proved in the next Chapter, and then (in the next after that) I will ſhew that this infallible Church is the Roman, and none but the Roman.

51. Again, I ſaid, that if Chriſt had intended the Book of Scriptures for the judge of all Controverſies, the knowledge of this point being ſo primely neceſſary, muſt needs be according to your principles evidently ſet down in Scripture, in w^e^ all points neceſſary to ſalvation are (as you ſay) evidently ſet down. You pretend here this point to be clear in Scripture, but I have largely ſhewed the contrary and anſwered your objection. And I retort it thus, that if God would have us in all controverſies guided by the Scripture only he would clearly have ſaid ſo in the ſe Scripture yea he would have told us the true undoubted Canon of Scripture. This is now unknown to you: And we are ſure diverſe parts of this Canon are loſt, what Scripture tels us *we muſt be judged by only part of Scripture?* I pray anſwer this.

Of my 14th. Number.

52. Moreover I added *that if God would have given us a Book for our Judge, he would never have given us for our Judge ſuch a Book as the Scripture is, which very often ſpeaketh obſcurely, ſometime ſo prophetically, that moſt would think it ſpoke of the preſent time, when it ſpeaketh of the time to come, that it ſpeaks of one perſon, for example of David, when it ſpeaketh of another, for example of Chriſt*; and much more I added to this effect, that I might be rightly underſtood when I ſaid that *God would never have given us ſuch a book for our Judge.* My adverſarie to avoid this Argument, ſo mangleth the ſenſe, that he may make my words ſound of a blaſphemous diſreſpect by reporting them as if I ſhould have ſaid, *If God had intended Scripture for our Judge, he would not have given us ſuch a Book as Scripture.* Which words taken without thoſe particles, *for our Judge*, ſeem to ſound *ſuch an imperfect book as Scripture*, but

but taken with thoſe particles (which purpoſely were added, to make the ſenſe of the writer appear) the ſenſe can offend no man capable of ſenſe. For what man of underſtanding would affectionately crie out *of diſreſpect, if not of blaſphemy againſt Scripture*, if he ſhould hear one ſay, *if God had intended ſtill the Scripture for ſole Judge in all Law Controverſies, he would never have given us ſuch a Book as the Scripture is for our Judge.* Would any ſober man let fall ſuch a cenſure upon ſuch an occaſion? Is it not manifeſt that the Scripture may be a Book as perfect as can be for the intent for which God made it, and yet not be fit to decide all Controverſies by it ſelf alone, it never being intended for that end. It is ſufficient that this Book provides an infallible means to judge them, by ſending us to the Church for our Judge. They truly diſgrace the Scripture, who will firſt make men believe that all neceſſary Controverſies are plainly decided by Scripture alone, and that God intended the Scripture for the plain deciſion of them, and then, when it comes to the trial, are not able to ſhew any Text of Scripture, deciding many and moſt important Controverſies: for this is in effect to ſay, God performed very unſufficiently what he intended to do, by Scripture. If what I ſaid gave you any advantage, ſhew it by diſproving what I ſaid.

53. Firſt, you ask how theſe words are put together, *ſo Prophetically, that moſt would think that the Scripture ſpeaketh of the time preſent, when it ſpeaketh of the time to come?* I anſwer, that it was fit the old Teſtament ſhould be Prophetical, and I intended nothing leſſe then to blame Scripture. And yet I ſay, that when the Scripture uſeth ſuch words as ſignifie to us a veritie preſent, as well as a veritie future, we (who have nothing but theſe words to direct us) cannot tell infallibly whether God intended by them to ſpeak onely of what was preſent, or of what was to come. And ſo Gods meaning in all theſe places is obſcure unto us. And if you can help us to any aſſured means of know-

ing

ing infallibly the hidden ſenſe of God, uttet'd in this maner, you ſhall do more then any of your Doctors ever did. Secondly, whereas you think it little to the purpoſe of him, who is to ſhew in how doubtful terms the Scriptures ſometimes expreſſe themſelves, when they ſpoke ſo, that you cannot tell whether *David* ſpeaketh of himſelf or of Chriſt, your judgement is very different from *Candaris*, that wiſe judicious man, *who had charge of all the Treaſure of the Queen of Æthiopia*, ( Acts 8. 27. ) He read *Iſaias*, the cleareſt of all the Prophets concerning Chriſt, and he read a place as clearly ſpeaking of Chriſt, as moſt places you can turn unto with all your ſkill, and yet when *Philip* ſaid to him, *Underſtandeſt thou what thou readeſt?* He, who was ſo prudent, and ſo ſincere a ſearcher of the Truth anſwered, *How can I except ſome man ſhould guide me?* And then he asked of his guide, that, of which he moſt doubted; *I pray thee of whom ſpeaketh the Prophet this? of himſelf or of ſome other man?* Had you been there you would have told him he had blamed Scripture as you tell me for the like cauſe. Who doubteth but Prophets ſhould ſpeak prophetically. And yet again, who doubteth but that this their ſpeaking ſo, makes them to need a Guide & an Interpreter.

54. I do not think that among your own Clergie or Laitie, you are as much eſteemed as he who ſpoke as fully of this point as I did: I mean Doctor *Ieremy Taylor in his Diſcourſe of the Liberty of Prophecying*, Sect. 3. where he proveth the uncertaintie of Arguments from Scripture, *By the many ſenſes of Scripture, when the Grammatical ſenſe is found out: for there is in very many Scriptures a double ſenſe, a Literal and a Spiritual, and both theſe Senſes are ſubdivided. For the Literal ſenſe is either Natural or Figurative, and the Spiritual ſometimes Allegorical, ſometimes Anagogical, ſometimes there are divers literal Senſes in the ſame place*; ſo he. Now it depends upon the ſecret intention of the Holy Ghoſt to have uſed theſe words in ſome one onely, or two, or more of theſe ſenſes. Is there no difficultie think

think you in finding out ſo great a ſecret, and that infallible as we muſt do in points neceſſary to ſalvation? And if you ſay the ſenſe is alwaies cleared out of ſome Text or other in ſuch points, you ſay more then you can prove. Take for an example theſe four words: *This is my Body*, you muſt ſay they are ſpoken in a Figurative ſenſe, and not in their Natural ſenſe: ſhew this in a Figurative ſenſe to be infallibly the true ſenſe by any other clear Text, or elſe you ſhew not what you ſay. Two hundred ſeveral Interpretations have been given of theſe four words. Is this a ſign that true ſenſe is eaſily known, and known infallibly? Is not this about a point neceſſarie to ſalvation?

55. To ſhew further the difficulty there was to know the undoubted meaning of Scripture even in precepts, (which being precepts are damnably broken) I uſed this argument: the Scripture uſeth the Imperative Mood as well when it counſels us when it commands. What infallible means then have we to know what is recommended onely to us as a Counſel or Command, as a precept to be kept under pain of damnation; Inſtead of teaching me this means you ſay *you cannot ſwallow this without chewing, becauſe I ſuppoſe that there are Counſels of perfection above things of Command*; whileſt you chew this, do not you ſee that your teeth bite Saint *Paul*; who expreſly ſuppoſeth with me, that *there be counſels of perfections above things of Command.* For (1 Cor. 7. 25.) he ſaith. *Concerning Virgins I have no Commandement of our Lord, yet I give Counſel.* And Verſe 38. *He that giveth his daughter in marriage doth well, but he that giveth her not in marriage doth better.* How doth this agree with your ſtrange Divinity, according to which we have done but our duty, and what we are obliged to do under a damnable ſin, when we have done as much as we could. Is this true? Might not this man have given his daughter in marriage who doth not give her? He might have done ſo, and done well according to Saint *Paul.* According to you he is bound to do

all.

all that he could do. But he could have done better in not giving her to marriage, therefore according to you he was bound not to give her under pain of damnation. Here I muſt intreat you to mark the words of the Text you alledge againſt me, *Luke* 17. *So likewiſe when you have done all thoſe things which are commanded you*; (he ſaith not which are onely commended by way of Council) *ſay we are unprofitable ſervants, we have done what we ought to do*, to wit, by an expreſſe Precept obliging under damnation. In one ſenſe this man who hath not married his daughter, may truly ſay, I have done what I ought to do, not out of ſtrict Obligation, binding under pain of Hell-fire; (for I might have done well in doing the contrarie,) but what I ought to do, out of more perfect charitie. To ſwallow this Apoſtolical Doctrine is far eaſier then to admit into ones mouth thoſe words of yours. *The Commandements of God are given to us according to the tenour of our abilitie in Adam.* What evident Text teacheth this? I am ſure Saint *Iohn* ſaith, *Hereby we do know that we know him if we keep his Commandements. He that ſaith I know him and keepeth not his Commandements, is a lyar, and the truth is not in him*, John 2. Therefore ſince *Adams* dayes God enabled us to keep his Commandements.

56. You go on as if I found fault with Scripture. I only find fault with thoſe who affirm Scripture to have been intended by God for an end, to which I ſhew it never was intended. Becauſe if it had been intended by God to teach us clearly all things neceſſarie to ſalvation (otherwiſe then by ſending us to the Church, and by bidding us keep our received Traditions) it would have ſet the things down clearly and diſtinctly, and not have left theſe points to be picked out, one out of one book, another out of another, no man knoweth directly where; yea divers books contained not ſo much as one of theſe points, which you hold neceſſarie to ſalvation, eſpecially in plain and clear terms. And thoſe books which do contain ſuch

ſuch points do intermingle ſo many other leſſe neceſſarie points, or points of doubtful neceſſitie, with thoſe which are wholly neceſſarie (without ever telling us of this leſſe or greater neceſſitie) that all the whole Bible muſt be very carefully, and very attentively read over (which is impoſſible, becauſe divers whole Books of the Bible are loſt) before a man can come to the infallible knowledge of ſuch points as you will ſay are neceſſarie, which points you ſay are but few, and the Books of Scripture are many, and divers more have been written and quite loſt; and how can we tell whether all theſe we have now, contain all points neceſſarie? For the moſt you pretend is, that in the whole Canon all points neceſſarie were delivered; we have not the whole Canon, but diverſe books of it have periſhed; Therefore we have no aſſurance that the Scripture we have containeth all things neceſſarie. The Scriptures we have, make a book ſo big, that the far greater part of the world (taken up with ſo many neceſſarie affairs) cannot in a very long ſpace of time read over this Book with any part of that exactneſſe, which according to your own Principles, muſt be required to find out, which points be neceſſarie to ſalvation. For to do this, they muſt firſt read over the whole Canon, and yet divers books of it are loſt, and not to be had, how ſhall they read them? Secondly, to have aſſurance that they have read over the whole Canon, they muſt read over ſuch books as we hold to be part of the true Canon, to ſee whether they be ſo or no, and uſe ſuch diligences as are neceſſarie for an infallible aſſurance. *They muſt alſo* note moſt accurately all places which may perhaps clearly deliver a neceſſarie point, when they ſhall have been conferred with other places, which perhaps be at the other end of the Bible, or may occur to me when I leſſe obſerve any kind of connexion with what I read before. *Beſides this*, for fear Tranſlations (which are only ſo farre Gods Word as they agree with the Original) ſhould be taken by me for Gods true Word; I muſt con-

sult with the Original, and with the true Original, of which I cannot get an undoubted copy infallibly secured from corruption, Is it likely that God, who hath promised us *a Way so direct unto us that fools cannot erre by it*, would intend to lead us by a way having so many passages open to errour. These difficulties shew that God did not intend this Book to be our onely guide. His wisedome directs him to the best means to compasse his intention. Even our ordinarie wisedom (if we had an intention to set forth a writing to end all necessarie Controversies) would direct us to set down plainly and clearly in one place all those (few as you say) points necessarie to be believed. When God determined to set down all the Jewish Ceremonies, you see how fully, particularly, and clearly he setteth them down in *Leviticus*. Points of faith necessarie to salvation import incomparably more then points of meer Ceremonie. If then God had intended a Book, by which only he was resolved to deliver unto us all points necessary to salvation, these points (as you say) being but few, he would in some one part of these books have clearly set down these few points, a thousand times more importing then the points of Ceremonies. Many hold that the Epistles of Saint *John* were written after his *Apocalyps*, and so (by order of time) that they were the very last part of the Canon. And yet in the very last part (of this my last part) of the Canon, Saint *Iohn* saith, *I had many things to write, but I will not with inke and pen write them. But I trust we shall see thee shortly, and we shall speak face to to face.* No man can say that *these many things* which St. *Iohn* had to write, were things unnecessarie; wherfore many necessary things may not be set down in the Canon. And yet the Canon is very compleat in order to its true end, and also in order to the ending of all Controversies by sending us to the Church for full instruction, as I have shewed. And it is apparently false which you say, that the Scripture doth give us everie particular point which is necessarie

ceſſarie to be believed, as I have ſhewed in this Chapter. And whereas you adde ſecondly, *That the Scripture giveth alſo many points not neceſſary*, you mark not that the vaſt number of thoſe points among which, here, and there (we are not aſſured where) the neceſſarie points are intermingled from the beginning of the Bible to the end, is a thing which would make any man far from being fully aſſured, that Gods intention was by this Book alone to decide all Controverſies about points onely neceſſarie, which might far more eaſily for our capacitie, have been done in ſome one Chapter of ſome one of theſe Books.

57. After this you urge that our Church hath not decided all neceſſary Controverſies. Sir, Our Doctrine is that the Church can decide any point formerly revealed when any neceſſity ſhall require it or the declaration of this point concern our Salvation. Salvation hath very ſecurely been had without the deciſion of thoſe points you ſpeak of. If circumſtances happen that Salvation cannot be had without their deciſion, they will then be decided. If you acknowledge a real neceſſity to be at all times of the infallible knowledge of thoſe points then by your own principles you are bound to ſay that they are plainly ſet down in Scripture. And I am ſure our Church hath determined that we are obliged to believe all Scripture with an undoubtful beliefe, either you muſt ſay theſe points are not neceſſary, and then all your arguments fall of themſelves, or elſe you muſt ſay theſe be plainly ſet down in Scripture, and then we are by our Church obliged to believe them with divine faith. I adde that our whole Church teacheth the definitions of Councils confirmed, to be infallible. Submit to this Judge appointed by God, who did bid us hear the Church, and you ſhall find her definitions not to leave you ignorant of what is neceſſary for you to know. To cavil at her, you will pretend that to be neceſſary which you will ſay the next moment is unneceſſary.

58. But to ſhew you further that the Scripture is not clear in all points neceſſary to Salvation, with ſuch claritie as is neceſſary to put an end effectually to all controverſies, I take a point or two ſet down with full as great clarity as diverſ other points can be ſhew'd to be ſet down; which other points, you do affirme both to be neceſſary to Salvation, and alſo to be ſet down clear enough, to decide the Controverſie for you; though they be ſet down with no greater claritie then thoſe points which I will ſpecifie; and which you will ſay be not ſet down clear enough to decide the Controverſie for us: whence the inconſequence of your proceedings will be made evident, whileſt all ſhall ſee, that you will pretend ſuch a degree of clarity in the Texts which you uſe to alledge for ſuch points, to be ſufficient to decide them for you, and by and by they ſhall ſee again a higher degree of clarity rejected by you as unſufficient to decide a point againſt you. To prove this the firſt point I ſpecifie is of the Sacrament of Extreme Unction. The text in your own Bible ſpeaketh thus, James 5. 14. *Is any ſick among you, let him call for the Elders* (Prieſts) *of the Church. And let them pray over him anointing him with oyle in the name of our Lord. And the prayer of the faithfull ſhall ſave the ſick; And the Lord ſhall raiſe him up. And if he hath committed ſins they ſhall be forgiven him.* What imports a dying man more then to have that applied to him in due manner by which he may be ſecured (upon the word of a God) that, *if he hath committed ſins they ſhall be forgiven him?* And yet you cry *ſuperſtition, ſuperſtition.* If a Prieſt be called for to pray over a ſick man, and *to anoint him with oile,* which is that Viſible Act to which inviſible grace, juſtifiing from ſinne, is promiſed in thoſe words, *And if he hath committed ſins, they ſhall be forgiven him.* How clear this place is, appeares by the very letter, in which we have all we deſire to make a Sacrament. A Viſible ſigne of inviſible grace. You will ſay, this clarity is not in a degree ſufficient to make a man believe

lieve with divine faith, that this Unction of anointing is a Sacrament, or a Visible signe of invisible Grace. And (so soon as I shall ask) you will tell me that your grand fundamental and Capital point, *All things necessarie to Salvation are clearly set down in Scripture*, is a point delivered in Scripture by Texts, having a sufficient degree of clarity to make it an Article to be believed with a divine faith; I call for those Texts, and you do give them as well as you can, (as I suppose) I examine them all in this Chapter (from my eighth Number to my fifteenth) and I dare Venture my life that no wise conscionable man will say that any one of those texts, or all put together, doe with as great a degree of claritie affirm *All things necessarie to Salvation to be plainly set down in Scripture alone*, as this text I alledged affirmeth this Sacrament of Anointing. But this, you say, is not affirmed with a degree of Clarity sufficient to decide the Controversie for us, and to ground an infallible belief of this point, Therefore that degree of Clarity is not sufficient to decide in your behalf that capital Controversie, and to ground an infallible beliefe of it. And yet for many other points (which I specified in the beginning of this Chapter) you have not so much Scripture as you have for this prime point, though I did chuse this for my instance, because I had examined all your texts. You give two answers to this Objection. The first is, that, *if the Scripture hath decided this point for us, then the Scripture can judge and end Controversies.* But Sir, doth it hence follow that it can end all necessary Controversies, because it can end this one Controversie? Again, is this Controversie by this Text ended? Doe not you still stand out in the contrarie opinion? This Text indeed might (as I said) seem in the impartial judgement of a prudent man, to say evidently that this anointing is a Sacrament, and sure I am that it saith it clearer then any Scripture you can bring for many points which you say are clearly decided by Scripture; yet we see

ſee by the experience which we have of you, and yours, that even this great degree of claritie in this Text will not ſerve to convince your judgments, whence it is manifeſtly inferred that a leſſe degree of claritie (which notwithſtanding is the higheſt, which can be found in many Texts that be the cleareſt alledgeable for many points neceſſary to ſalvation) will not effectually end the controverſies about thoſe points. And therefore there muſt be ſome other means to end them. Your Second Anſwer is flatly againſt the Text, for you ſay *theſe words do only relate to the guift of healing in thoſe daies*: and the Scripture ſaith they have alſo a relation to the healing of the Soul. *If he hath committed ſins they ſhall be forgiven him.* I pray what Scripture have you to prove that the Elders in thoſe daies did commonly cure all ſick anointing them with oile? I am ſure you can alledge nothing but ſome uncertain conjecture. I asked you alſo if you had one place of Scripture half as clear againſt this Sacrament of anointing, as the Text I brought was clear for it? But you neither did nor could give me any.

59. The ſecond point which I did chuſe to prove that ſuch Texts of Scripture, as are clearer then thoſe Texts, which you can alledge for many neceſſarie points; for example cleater then any Text for the Sunday, or baptizing children, is (notwithſtanding this greater degree of claritie) rejected by you, as not ſufficient to decide the controverſie againſt you. Therefore I ſay, you moſt inconſequently proceed when you affirm far leſſe clearer Texts ſufficient to decide all Controverſies. The Text brought by me, and rejected thus by you, was, *This is my Body*. Words expreſſed by four ſeveral Writers of the Scripture without any intimation of their being ſpoken Figuratively. And if you confer this place with the ſixth of Saint *Iohn*, he hath theſe words, *The bread that I will give is my fleſh*, and then (as it were purpoſely to ſhew he ſpoke not Figuratively) he added, *My Fleſh is meat indeed, and*

*and my Blood is drink indeed.* Notwithſtanding theſe ſo *clear* Texts you hold that the Scripture decideth this point againſt us with a deciſion ſufficient to end the controverſie, And yet for the contrarie all the Texts you can bring have not that degree of claritie which theſe Texts have againſt you. But you deny that theſe Texts decide againſt you. Therefore (to ſpeak with tolerable conſequence) you ſhould acknowledge that leſſe clear Texts cannot decide againſt us; yet being, by your owne main principle, bound to ſhew that all points neceſſarie be clearly determined according to truth in Scripture, you are put upon a neceſſitie to ſay that leſſe clear Texts ſuffice to determine this controverſie for you, though you ſtifly maintain that more clear Texts are not able to determine againſt you. By which it is apparent how falſe that Principle is which forceth you to utter theſe inconſequent conſequences. By this alſo you may ſee that the Contradiction you would find in my words for ſaying on the one ſide *theſe Texts are clear*, and on the other ſide *that this Controverſie the Scripture doth* not *decide*, doth ariſe out of my ſpeaking according to your principles. For you on the one ſide ſay that other Texts (which are manifeſtly leſſe clear) are clear enough to end the controverſies; therefore theſe wch are clearer, muſt needs be clear enough for that end. And again you ſay on the other ſide, by theſe our Texts (clearer then yours) this Controverſie is not clearlie decided. Therefore I muſt conſequentlie ſay, that according to you *This Controverſie the Scripture doth not decide.* It is according to your Principles that theſe Texts *muſt be clear*, becauſe they be clearer then thoſe which you are forced to affirme clear; and again you muſt ſay *they be not clear*, for fear you ſhould confeſs them to decide againſt you. Now if theſe two places be denied to be clear, with a clarity ſufficient to put an end to the Controverſie, then according to my principles ſcarce any Controverſie will ever be decided by any Text. And this is moſt for my turn

to

to ſhew the neceſſity of a living Judge: whereas afterwards you take occaſion to diſpute of this Sacrament, you do not do it as it ſhould here have been done to the preſent purpoſe, to wit, by alledging more clear Texts to prove that Chriſts true body is not really in the Sacrament, then I alledge to prove that it was really in it. For theſe Texts I do call, Theſe Texts I require. Without you give me theſe more clear Texts, you will never give me a ſatisfactorie anſwer. All other things I wave of until I have theſe clearer Texts. The difference of theſe two hundred interpretations about theſe four words *This is my Body*, though they be not owned by you, yet they make ſtrongly againſt you in this reſpect, that they ſhew the Text of Scripture not to have ended, but to have occaſioned theſe endleſſe differences. And conſequently they ſhew this point not to be clear out of Scripture. You in vain are buſie about other things which are not to the purpoſe, ſo to entertain your Reader that he may not mark your omitting the main point, which was to ſhew this great Controverſie to be clearly decided on your ſide by Scripture onely.

Of my 15th. Number.

60. I go on ſtill preſſing other points, the belief of which points your ſelf hold neceſſarie to ſalvation, and yet you cannot ſhew them evidently taught in Scripture. For you cannot produce an evident Text, teaching that *God the Father is not begotten, God the Son is not made, but begotten by his Father onely, that the Holy Ghoſt is neither made nor begotten but proceedeth, and that both from the Father and the Son.* And *that God the Son is Conſubſtantial to his Father.* Your anſwer to this is moſt highly unſatisfactorie. You ſay that *although the matter of theſe points be not found* in terminis *in Scripture, yet the ſenſe of them, according to equivalence, may as well as Tranſubſtantiation?* To be as clearly ſet down as Tranſubſtantiation in Scripture, is (according to your own principles) not to be clearly ſet down at all. In your anſwer you were to ſhew that theſe points were clear-

ly

ly ſet down in Scripture, and you anſwer that they are as clearly ſet down as a point which is not clearly ſet down. Is this any way ſatisfactorie? Neither is it more ſatisfactorie if you mean to argue out of our own principles, for according to us, all points neceſſarie (and this point in particular) are not clearly ſet down in Scripture. And to prove this I have laboured all this Chapter. So that you neither ſatisfie according to your own nor our Principles. Your ſecond anſwer is deſtroyed by your former, for whileſt in that you profeſſe to hold theſe Articles, and not hold them upon the authoritie of the Church, you leave your ſelf no other authoritie, upon which you can hold them but onely ſuch Texts of Scripture as are not clear, and no more ſufficient to ground faith, then other places are to ground a belief of Tranſubſtantiation. Be ſuch places ſufficient?

61. For another neceſſarie point not plainly ſet down in Scripture, I urge Baptiſme of children, which is by no evident Text of Scripture taught us. You anſwer that it is not neceſſary for the ſalvation of the children to be baptized. And to prove this pernicious doctrine, you bring a Text which clearly ſpeaketh onely of men old enough to believe and deſire Baptiſme. For your Text is, *He that believeth* (he is then old enough to believe) *and is baptized ſhall be ſaved, but he that believeth not* (and conſequently would poſitively not be baptized) *ſhall be damned.* This Text you ſee, ſpeaketh nothing of children, and whileſt it damneth thoſe who would not ſo much as believe, it ſheweth it ſelf to ſpeak of thoſe who would not be baptiſed, and theſe it damneth. How doth it then intimate that thoſe who are children, and could have onely baptiſme, *in re*, and not *in voto*, ſhould be ſaved without Baptiſme, for which point you bring it, and yet of this point it ſpeaketh not at all; much leſſe doth it ſpeak as clearly as another text ſpeaketh the quite contrary, to wit, *Except a man be born of water and the ſpirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdome* Of my 16th. Number.

*dome of Heaven*, Jo. 3. v. 5. Hear your own Doctor *Tayler in his defence of Epiſcopacy*, Sect. 19. P. 100. *Baptiſme of Infants is of ordinary neceſsitie to all that ever cried, and yet the Church hath founded this Rite Rule upon the Tradition of the Apoſtles: And wiſe men* (of whom I hope you are one) *do eaſily obſerve that the Anabaptiſts can by the ſame probability of Scripture inforce a neceſsitie of communicating Infants upon us, as we doe of baptizing Infants upon them; Therefore a great Maſter of Geneva in a Book he writ againſt the Anabaptiſts was forced to flie to Apoſtolical traditional Ordination. They that deny this* (Ordinarie neceſſitie of baptizing Infants) *are by the juſt Anathema of the Catholick Church, confidently condemned for Heretickes*: ſo he. This *ordinary neceſsitie of Baptiſme to all that ever cried*, You denie; *Therefore by the juſt Anathema of the Catholick Church*, you are condemned for an Heretick: yea you go further then the Pelagian Hereſie, for they were counted Hereticks (See Saint *Auſt. Hereſi.* 88.) for ſaying, *Although Infants be not baptized, they ſhall poſſeſſe an eternal and bleſſed life, though it be out of the Kingdome of God*: You will admit them into the poſſeſſion thereof even unto the Kingdome of God. Whereas your own *Muſculus* (*in Locis, Tit. de Baptiſmo*) ſaith; *The Fathers denied ſalvation to the Children who died without Baptiſme, though their Parents were faithful.* And by reaſon of this neceſſitie of Baptiſme to the ſalvation of Infants, held ſo generally, *Calvin* himſelf ſaith, *It was uſual many Ages ſince, even almoſt from the beginning of the Church, that in danger of death Lay-people might baptize*, Inſtitut. (Lib. 4. Cap. 15. Numb. 20.) *And to ſay the contrarie were to croſſe all Antiquitie*, as your *Bilſon* confeſſeth in his *Conference at Hampton Court*. *Hooker* ſaith no leſſe in his 5. book of *Eccleſiaſt. Policy* 62. A number of other learned Proteſtants are againſt your Opinion. But I ſay leſſe of this point, for your own Opinion giveth me advantage enough to prove what I intend, that is, a point to be neceſſarie, and yet

yet not plainly set down in Scripture; if you grant *that there is a Precept necessary to be fulfilled by Parents that they procure their Children to be baptized.* But why God should command this, the Children being as well saved without it (according to you) as with it, still remains to be proved. I stand upon your grant of this Precept as necessarily to be fulfilled by the Parents. This Precept is necessary to be fulfilled. This Precept is not plainly set down in Scripture. Therefore all necessarie points are not plainly set down in Scripture. Your answer will not here help you out, you say, *Whatsoever is necessarily inferred from Scripture is binding in the Vertue of the Principle.* But you cannot shew that this precept, A given to the Parents, is necessarily inferred out of Scripture. Not out of the Institution of our Saviour, for he also instituted the Eucharist not necessarie for Infants not out of the substitution to Circumcision, for so it should not be necessarie to women, nor nor to any but those of the Iewish Nation to whom onely Circumcision was given as necessarie. Is this a necessarie Consequence? *Circumcision was necessarie for the male children, Ergo Baptisme is necessarie for male and female.* You see it is not halfe true. Neither is that a necessarie Consequence which is drawne from *the baptising of whole families*: for first, as we read whole families were baptized, so we read that whole families believed. So Iohn. 4. verse 53. *Himselfe believed and his whole family.* Will you hence evidently infer *that the little Children under yeares of discretion also believed*, as you infer that they are to be baptized by a necessarie precept. Again this illation is far from being evident, for it is not evident that there be litle ones in every family alive, and those also under the age of discretion. In many families all the little ones that be alive are above seaven yeares old. There be many families of people newly married who have not yet any Children; There be many families of people who never had Children as those who are barren,

Others have loſt all they had by death. It is then no evident conſequence, *He baptized the whole family, therefore he baptized litle Infants*, I inſiſt not upon the Authorities I alledged out of Saint *Auſtin*. St *Chryſoſt*. becauſe I deale with one who little regards authoritie confeſſed to be the Fathers.

62. Now Sir, to conclude this long Chapter, I will ſhew that I conclude this point (and ſo I doe all the former) juſt as you ſay I muſt conclude. For you ſay to me *you muſt prove that thoſe points were and ought to be determined by the Church upon neceſſitie of Salvation*. This I prove by this argument. This point and all the former are neceſſarie to be believed with an infallible aſſent. But we cannot believe any point with an infallible aſſent, unleſſe it be determined by an infallible authoritie; therefore we muſt find out an infallible authoritie which hath determined theſe points. The authoritie of the Scripture (as I have proved) hath not determined theſe points. We muſt therefore find out ſome other infallible authoritie upon whoſe determination we may be able to do, that which to be ſaved we muſt do, to wit, upon which we may be able to believe theſe points with an infallible aſſent: No ſuch infallible Authoritie can be found on Earth, if we deny the Authoritie of the Church to be infallible. I conclude then that her Authoritie muſt needs be infallible.

# The Fourth Chapter.

## *The Church is this Judge. Her Authoritie Infallible.*

NO better beginning can I give to this Chapter, then the very laſt Number of the laſt Chapter, which I muſt intreat my reader to note moſt careſully, ſo to obſerve the forcible deduction by which I prove the neceſſitie of a judge, different from Scripture, who muſt be infallible for the reaſon there aſſigned, and who can be no other then the Church. This proofe alone might ſerve the turn, yet I adde. Of my 17th. Number.

2. Firſt thoſe words *Matthew* 12. 19 ſpoken to Saint *Peter*; *upon this Rock I will build my Church and the gates of Hell ſhall not prevail againſt it*; theſe words allow the Church a ſecuritie from ever admitting any doctrin ſo pernitious that *the gates of Hell may prevail againſt her*. And this promiſe made to the Church is that which mainly makes to my purpoſe; Whether the church be built upon Saint *Peter*, and his Succeſſors, or upon the faith of Saint *Peter*, is not the thing I cheifly here aim at. *My* aim is to find *a Church built on a Rock* ſo ſtrong that no error ſhall ever overthrow it. And ſo I have nothing to do with your long diſputation about Saint *Peter*. I am now ſecured the Church ſhall never be a *Neſt of Errors, Idolatrous, ſuperſtitious, wickedly aſſuming the authoritie of an infallible tribunall without ſufficient warrant*. All or any of theſe things would bring her to the gates of Hell, they being all damnable impieties. That, what is ſaid of this infallibility of the Church, only concerns the Roman Church, I will ſhew in the next Chapter. Have patience until then or read that firſt; You being to ſay nothing againſt me

until

untill you begin *to ſay ſixthly, That you have enough againſt* me for *ſaying the Church is ſecured from all damnable errors* by this promiſe. For this maketh you think my meaning to be, that Chriſt doth not intend here to exempt the Church from all error but only damnable. But Sir my meaning in ſpecifying her exemption *from damnable errour* was only that time to take for granted, that, which moſt of yours uſe to grant, and even thence to preſſe, your further, you grant the Church free from damnable errour, whence I have at leaſt thus much *that no body ſhall be damned for following the guidance of the Church.* And I have alſo that the whole Church, being thus by divine aſſiſtance ſecured from erring damnably, is ſecured from ever being deſtroyed by any damnable error, ſhe is therefore alwayes to have ſuch a viſible exiſtence as is neceſſarie to afford a guidance ſecured from erring damnable by it. Now by what Logick do you inferre that *becauſe the Church is ſecured from all damnable errour, therefore according to my doctrine ſhee is not ſecured from other errours?* All you build, upon this conſequence, falls to the ground. Going on I find you by the way quarelling with one of the Cardinall vertues, even Prudence her ſelf, which you intimate then only to have place, when Religion is choſen by intereſt. I pray do you thinke in earneſt that men cannot proceed prudently in the choiſe of their Religion? Then you conclude *that all the force my former argument hath it hath from Scripture.* Is not my argument the better for this againſt you, who profeſſe to believe Scripture to be Gods undoubted word, independently of the authority of the Church, becauſe it is clearly manifeſted to you, to be ſo by its light, as the Sun by his light. Is it not a convincing argument which is ſtrengthened with an authoritie acknowledged ſo firme? Againſt a Heathen (untill I had proved Scripture to him) I would not uſe this argument.

4. Preſently I find you again ſtumbling at the ſenſe in which

which I took the word *damnable*, as if I ſhould allow the following of the Church in other errours. No Sir, you cannot follow her in other errors, becauſe ſhe cannot go before you in any errour; not in any damnable errour, as your owne ſelves teach, no nor in any other errour as in this very next argument is proved, if you mark the force of it.

5. The force then of my next Argument is this, God commandeth us to obey the Church and hear her; in obeying her and hearing her, we follow Gods Command. But no kind of errour, little, or great, can be incurred, by following Gods Command, therefore we can be lead into no kind of errour by following the Church. Again you your ſelves ſay *it is impoſſible to be obliged to aſſent to an errour, though it be not a damnable errour.* Wherefore if I can prove that we are obliged to follow the Church, I ſhall prove alſo that ſhee cannot guide us into any kind of errour. This I prove by that text *Matthew* 18. verſe 18. *If he will not hear the Church let him be unto thee as a publican or a Heathen.* Therefore meerly, and purely, for not hearing the Church, a man is to be held and truely, according to Gods judgment, deſerving to be held, a publican or Heathen: but all we are obliged not to deſerve to be held by Gods judgement, Publicans or heathens, Therefore all are obliged to hear the Church, being that meerly and purely for not hearing her, they are to be held, and deſervingly held, according to Gods judgment, Publicans and Heathens, as is alſo further inſinuated in the next verſe, where it is ſaid, this ſentence ſhall be ratified in Heaven. Now if any man reply that we are to heare the Church ſo long as ſhe ſwerveth not from Gods word; my anſwer is, that, to ſwerve from Gods word is to erre; but this text proveth ſhe cannot erre. *Ergo*, it proveth that ſhe cannot ſwerve from Gods word, and indeed, if ſhe could, the meerly not hearing her, could not deſerve, that a man ſhould deſerve to be accounted, according to Gods judgement, a Publican or Heathen. But you tell me *this text is*,

*to*

*to be understood, not of matters of faith or unbelief, but of matters of trespasse between brother and brother, and refractorines in the person. And that it respects excommunication by censure, in which also it may erre. Neither is a man bound to believe the censure is just, unless it appears to be so.* This last assertion of yours is very extravagant doctrine, for the unanimous opinion of learned men is, *That a man is bound to hold his superiours censure or command to be just, unless the contrary appears evident.* See your own Doctors, *Chillingworth*, P. 308, N. 108. *Hooker*, P. 310, 311. N. 110. *Laud*, P. 226. And indeed you bring all to this, that, when all comes to all, you are the last judge, to whose sentence finally all comes to be referred, and not to the sentence of the Church, for you reserve to your selfe the last judgement of her sentence, *to see whether it be just or no in your own private opinion.* Sir, if the contrary be not evident, the Church (who is Superior) is to be followed, and obeyed. If the contrary be evident it is impossible such a superior as the Church is, assembled in a general Council should not mark that evidence, without we will call that evident, or not evident, which is for our present turn to call evident or not evident. That which is truly evident will of it selfe appear to be so at least to the most judicious, upright, and best instructed Prelates of the Church. And this is to be said according to human Reason, although they had no infallible promise of a more then humane assistance, from the Holy Ghost. Moreover Sir, let us if you please, not passe so farre as the Censure, but let us make a stay in the mere consideration only of the cause, for which the censure is given: that the cause is not hearing the Church; for this, and meerly for this only cause, according to the text, this man is (according to Gods judgement) deservedly to be held as a Publican or Heathen; and therefore, if for this act of not hearing the Church, the censure cometh to be after wards pronounced against him, that censure will be made good in Heaven, as the next

verse

verſe clearly ſaith; Wherefore it is impoſſible that this Cenſure ſhould be unjuſt, if he truly be guilty of not hearing the Church. It is true that a man may by falſe information, or ſome ſuch way be judged to be guilty of not hearing the Church, when really he is not guilty, and ſo there may be an errour in the miſtake of the fact, and thus *Clave errante* in mater of fact, the ſentence will not be ratified in Heaven. But this is nothing to the purpoſe, for ſtill he, who is truly guilty of not hearing the Church, is for that only fact, and meerly for that cauſe, to be held deſervedly, according to Gods judgment, as a publican or Heathen. And ſo the Church cannot errour in denouncing Excommunication againſt ſuch a perſon. And hence you ſee how truely miſerable ſuch a perſon is, and how it muſt needs be damnable unto him not to heare the Church, which not to hear, maketh a man to be held as a Publican or Heathen moſt deſervedly, and according to Gods owne judgement. To hold himſelf not to deſerve this puniſhment, is to hold againſt Scripture. You highly wrong Saint *Athanaſius*, to ſay he heard not the Church, See my 9. Number.

Theſe my Premiſſes being made good, it followeth clearly, that no man is ſecure in conſcience who will not obey the Church. And hence again it followeth that this Church cannot erre, at leaſt damnably, for elſe a Man might in Conſcience be bound to follow a damnable errour. No, ſhe cannot erre in an errour not damnable, becauſe alſo it very true which you lately ſaid, that ſo men ſhould be bound to aſſent unto an errour which is impoſſible. Hence that common doctrine of Antiquity *That it is not poſsible to have a juſt cauſe to ſeparate from the Church.* And it cannot be ſaid that any man ſeparates himſelfe not from the Church, but her errours; being ſhe is ſecured from all errour; as appeareth manifeſtly by our obligation to hear her; you tell me that *this text*, obliging to

hear the Church, *is meant onely of treſpaſſes betwixt Brother, and Brother, which treſpaſſes are alſo to be told to every particular Church and to Severall Prelates, and therefore this place, ſay you, maketh nothing for the authority of the Vniverſall Church.* Sir, I grant particular treſpaſſes are to be referr'd to particular Prelats, and that the Church is not to be called to a general Counſel, for every private mans treſpaſſes; ſingular private men are to be condemned by the particular Prelates of their particular Churches, proceeding according to the known Decrees and Orders of the Univerſal Church. If he clearly diſobeyeth them thus proceeding, he diſobeyeth the Univerſall Church. And for this act merely deſerveth, according to Gods own judgement, to be accounted as a Publican and Heathen. So he who diſobeyeth the particular Judge, judging according to the known Lawes of the Common-wealth, diſobeyes the Common-wealth. And it is this not obeying the Church, and the not hearing her, which exaggerates the crime, whence you ſee the not hearing the particular Prelates, in ſo well ordered a Communitie as the Church is, may come to be commonly the ſelf ſame crime with the not hearing of the Church. And becauſe all ſuch Prelates (when the contrary is not apparently manifeſt) are ſuppoſed to do their duty in giving ſentence according to the known Decrees, Orders and Canons of the Univerſal Church, as we uſually ſay, thoſe who diſobey the Judges diſobey the Commonwealth: ſo generally ſpeaking, thoſe who diſobey the Prelates of the particular Church, diſobey the Univerſal Church, commanding them to proceed according to her Decrees, Definitions, and Canons. So that at laſt this diſobedience is againſt Chriſt, and God himſelf, according to that which God ſaid to *Samuel*, Lib. 1. Cap. 8. *They have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me.* And Chriſt to his Diſciples (the firſt Prelates of the Church.) *He that deſpiſeth you, deſpiſeth me.* And therefore Chriſt commanded the lawful Succeſſours

ceſſours of *Moſes* to be followed in what they delivered by publick authority, although they were wicked in their private lives, and many of them publickly did teach Errours though not by publick authoritie, or authorized by any Definition of that Seat, which private Errours Chriſt called *the Leaven of the Phariſees*, bidding his Apoſtles *take heed of it*; But concerning what that Seat did by publick Definition, Chriſt was ſo far from bidding people to take heed of it, that he in as general terms, as men ſpeak when they would ſpeak without any exception, *Said to the whole promiſcuous multitude, and alſo to his diſciples, upon the Chair of* Moſes *have ſetten the Scribes & Phariſees. All therefore whatſoever they bid you obſerve, that obſerve and doe*; Mark theſe moſt ample words. *All therefore whatſoever.* O! will you ſay, what if they bid us do againſt the Scriptures; Why, this very ſaying of Chriſt ſheweth they were ſecured from ever doing againſt the Scripture when they proceeded by way of defining with Publick authority. If you object, that they condemned our Saviour by publike authority, you have your Anſwer Number 9. Say I we muſt hear the Church, and becauſe we muſt Univerſally hear her (for ſhe doubtleſs hath to the full as much reaſon to be heard as the old Iewiſh Church then had) ſhe muſt be confeſſed to have full aſſurance never to gainſay the Scripture. And as the Synagogues Authority was not limited ſo as to be obeyed and heard onely in point of treſpaſſe betwixt Brother and Brother, but was to be extended to *All whatſoever* they ſhould order: So you can not (with out depreſſing the Authority of Chriſts Church *who had a better Covenant eſtabliſhed upon better promiſes* Hebrews 8. 6.) hinder her power from being extended to *All whatſoever* ſhe ſhall Order. It muſt not therefore be confined only to treſpaſſe betwixt Brother and Brother; But we muſt of neceſſity, for the reaſon now expreſſed, argue thus, That being ſhe is to be heard, even in Controverſies concerning treſpaſſes betwixt Brother and Bro-

ther, much more is she to be heard in such trespasses as are committed by one Brother against all his Brothers and their deareſt Mother the Church. Then or never he is to be complained of, And if this obstinacy in persevering in trespasses betwixt Brother and Brother deserveth that a Man should be held as a Publican and a Heathen, he incomparably more deserveth to be held so, who being commanded by the Church to desist from such pernicious opinions as ruine the Soules of his Brothers, and tear asunder the bowells of his Mother, still persists in his impious doctrine, and in that most infectious, and Soul-murthring crime of hereſie the most heinous trespass against all our Brothers. Either such a crime or no crime is to be told the Church. Yea Saint *Thomas* calleth Schisme (of which Hereſie is alwaies guilty) the higheſt sin against the whole Comunity of our brother hood. Now this crime is to be told first to the particular Prelats as soon as it is perceivd to be begining to creep like a canker, as the Scripture saith Hereſie doth. If by this judgement of particular Prelats this crime be clearely found to be indeed Hereſie, or a doctrine oppoſit to the known former definitions of the Church Universall, they are to excommunicate him who is pertinacious in this soul-murthering Crime, and this sentence is sure to be ratified in Heaven; becauſe he who hath oppoſed in Doctrine the known Definitions of the Church, hath not heard nor obeyed her, for which onely fact (according to the clear sentence of Scripture) he deſervedly is to be accounted as a Publican or Heathen. Now if the Crime be not clearly against the known doctrine of the Universal Church, or not so evident against it, but many hold the contrary, the particular Prelates are bound to acquaint the head of the Church therewith. This supreme Prelate of the Church is bound to use the fulneſs of his authoritie to supreſſe the arising Hereſie. He may forbid (if he feareth danger in the doctrine) that no such doctrine be publiſhed untill the Church shall think,

think it fit. And then all muſt doe as Saint *Paul* ſaith, *Hebr.* 13. v. 27. *Obey their Prelates.* Thus far the power of the ſupreme Prelates is extended by the conſent of the whole Church. He therefore that in this caſe obeyeth not, is guilty of not hearing the Church, which ſingle crime maketh a man deſervedly accounted as a Publican or *Heathen*. Now though the Supreme head of the Church be as infallible as Saint *Peter* was, yet if he ſeeth this newly vented doctrine fit to be declared Hereſie, if it be ſo; or to be imbraced, if it be fitting, and propoſed to all Chriſtendome, then is the true time of calling a general Council, and not to let the people contend by allegations of Scripture. So though the Apoſtles were all infallible in their Doctrine yet they would not determine that grave queſtion *Acts* 15. without calling a Council *To conſider of this word*, in which there was made a great *diſputation*; for this is neceſſarie for the fuller conviction of Hereticks, fuller ſatisfaction of the weaker ſort, and further comfort of the whole Church, to ſee truth to triumph, upheld by the ſhoulders of all Chriſtendom; what proceeding could be more ſweet or more orderly; what expoſition more agreable to this Text, *Tell the Church*, which denuntiation is to proceed by degrees from lower to higher Judges, as is there expreſſed. And Conſequently when the ſentence of the Higheſt tribunal of all is rejected, then or never, a man is deſervedly to be accounted a Publican or a Heathen for not hearing the Church univerſall. She therefore under ſo great a penalty being alwayes to be heard, is ſecured from all kind of errour what ſoever, in matters of faith belonging to her tribunall, and ſo we muſt grant her to be infallible. I have then already found out ſuch a judge, as I ſought for, a judge in matters of faith, a living judge, and infallible (as you would have him) *with an infallibility excluding all errour in what ſoever he propoſeth or decreeth, or all poſſibility of errour.* For if it were poſſible for this judge to impoſe an errour, Chriſt

could

could not possibly have declared it to be so heinous a crime not, to hear the Church being that it might have been no crime at all. He obliged all to obey and hear her, she therefore cannot lead us into an error. For as you truly say *To be bound to assent to an errour is impossible.* Our infallibility of knowledge concerning this point is as great as it is of those points, which are delivered by Scripture. And therefore you may stand up to my Creed, and that far more securely then stand out against such a Church: the not hearing of which is so great a crime. This Church is infallible and by manifest consequence only the *Roman* Church, as I shall demonstrate the next Chapter, Number 2.

7. Here by the way you tell me, That *If I would go the right way in this Dispute, I should use another method, for whereas I would argue the Church to be this Judge, which we cannot safely disobey, I should rather shew* a priori, *That the Church is infallible in whatsoever it doth define, and therefore ought to be obeyed in all things whatsoever.* But Sir, when I come to use this very method, I do foresee that it will so gald you, that you will cry out to have this burthensome, heavy argument cast upon the other shoulder, from which you now would have it shifted, to avoid the present trouble it causeth you, you shall see if it fall not out as I said, And that in this Chapter *Numb.* 52.

Of my 18th. Number.

8. As for St. *Austins* Authority, I must here lay it aside as well as every where else, for fear I should lose my labour even after I have proved what I should.

9. You fly upon me for flying to that Text of *Malachy* 2. 7. *The Priests Lips shall keep Knowledge, and they shall require the Law from his Mouth, because he is the Angel of the Lord of Hosts.* Concerning the translation of which Text, I truly charge your Bible of corruption for reading thus, *The Priests Lips should keep the Law, and they should seek the Law at his Mouth,* Whereas all Originals speak clearly in the future tense, as the Hebrew doth, and

and alſo the Greek and Latin, which two Languages want not a ſubjunctive Mood; you ask, *Is this Text meant of the Prieſts of Rome?* I told you it was not. And I did ſay expreſly that I added this Text to take away from you all wondering at us, for allowing that to be practiſed towards the Prieſts of the new Law (whoſe authority doubtleſſe excells thoſe of the old Law) which was practiſed towards the Prieſts of the old Law, in which thoſe who ſearched for the true knowledge of the Law, were not directed to ſeek that knowledge by their own reading the Scriptures, but they were to ſearch it by having recourſe to the Prieſts, who never (univerſally) ſhould fail at any time (mark that I ſpeak *by univerſal conſent*) to deliver falſe doctrine. As for private Prieſts they be like Private tranſlations of the word of God; If what they deliver agree with the doctrine of the Church, their doctrine is infallible; not for their private delivery of it, but for the authority of their Church, as Tranſlators are not to be believed for their authority but for their agreeing with the word of God. But there is a vaſt difference in this that the agreeing of the Tranſlation with the Original is wonderful hard to know, eſpecially when the Original it ſelfe cannot be known (by thoſe who admit of an infallible Church) by any infallible knowledge. The argument of the Prieſts with the Publick Doctrine of the Church, is eaſily known, becauſe her doctrine is ſo carefully publiſhed amongſt all underſtanding men. And as it is eaſy to know that *Homo* doth truly ſignifie *a man*, for though one ignorant or malitious Fellow ſhould ſay it ſignified a beaſt, yet the conſent of all others would manifeſt that mans perverſity. If a queſtion were propoſed in a matter of doubt in which their opinions varied, then men are to proceed as I juſt now declared Num. 9. And then when the cauſe ſhould be decided by the High Prieſts he who would not not hear him was deſervedly put to death *Deutronomy*. 17. I know you told me in another place that the Jewiſh Church

Church erred. I did deny it, why? Did not they erre in condemning our Saviour. Yes, but then the Jewiſh Church erred not. The true high Prieſt (without whom there is no true Repreſentative Church) erred not *Caiphas*, was not the true High Prieſt for another was lawfully declared to be ſo. This other true High Prieſt was Chriſt, who before his condemnation had ſufficiently for a legall declaration proclaimed himſelf to be the true Meſſias, the true Anointed of our Lord. This true high Prieſt erred not: The true head of the Church not erring the Church cannot be ſaid to erre. The true head of the Church defined not with the Council of *Ariminum*: Saint *Athanaſius* was bound to follow the Church defining, which defined not in that Council, for the Head of the Church not defining with the body, the whole body, or Church, defined not. Therefore I ſay again you erre when you ſay, *He ſhould have been bound in Conſcience by the cenſure of the Church to have been an Arrian. The* Church, is the High Prieſt defining with a lawful general Council. The High Prieſt defining in a general Council erred not. I wonder you goe about alſo to juſtify the Tranſlators proceedings, becauſe who think the *ſcope of the ſacred writer doth bear* it. Is not this to give Tranſlators leave, together with their Tranſlation to obtrude their gloſſe, and what they imagin the *ſcope ſhould* be? Is this a ſound Tranſlation? Maſter *Broughton* one of the beſt skilled in Hebrew and Greek of your Church, did according to his great skill, give a truer cenſure of your Tranſlation *in his advertiſement of corruption to your Biſhops* ſaying, *That their publick Tranſlation of Scriptures into Engliſh is ſuch as it perverteth the Text of the old Teſtament in Eight hundred fourty eight places. And that it cauſeth Millions of Millions to reject the new Teſtament and to run to eternall flames.* In what caſe then are they who take all that this Bible ſaith, for the undoubted word of God. When *Tindal* in the beginning of your Reformation, Tranſlated Gods Word into Engliſh, he did reform it ſo like one

of

of your great Reformers, that Bishop *Tonstall noted no lesse then two thousand Corruptions in the New Testament only*, Is not this good dealing in so short a volume; Is reading of these Translations called by you the *Knowledge of Scripture*; Chap. 1. Num. 3.

10. But to go on with my former discourse I did say, *let any man aske the Priests of our Church what is the known doctrine of the Church and let him rest securely when he knows* that. This you say is unreasonable, because the Priests are not infallible. But Sir, do you not marke that I ground their faith not upon the Priest but upon the Church Universal. Just as you say, you *ground your faith not upon your Translations* which only conveigh (as the Priests doe) the word of God to the searcher of it; yet we have incomparable more assurance of the agreement of what the Priests say to be the known doctrin of the Church, with the true doctrine of the Church; then you have of the agreement of your most corrupted (as we now shewed) Translations, with the true Word of God, which I explicated more largely in the beginning of the last Number: whence you will see, that when by fallible men we know that this word *Homo a man* signifieth a man and not a beast, that when I find in Scripture that God became *Homo* a man, I am infallibly assured he became a true man and not a beast Or a sea-man; so when by fallible men we know assuredly enough to make it evidently credible that this is the doctrine of the Church, we are assured by the Church that is true. For the Church is infallible as I am here proving, and secured from all errour which the Scripture (to those who rejects the Church) are not neither in their Translations as I have here shewed, nor in their Original, as I shewed in the last chap Numb. 35. And again although you were secured of the true Scripture: yet you are not secured of the true sense of it, as I shewed there Num. 50. And yet again a great many necessary Controversies are not contained in Scripture, as I shewed in the

Of my 19th. Number.

beginning and ending of that Chapter, which whosoever shall read will wonder with what confidence you ask, *well, and are not all things necessary taught in the Scripture?* I have also shewed you it is false, that what Authority the Church hath it hath from the Scripture, see Chap. 3. N. 30. 31. 32. yea immediatly before those places, I did (by eight arguments) shew that you have no infallible assurance of true Scripture if you deny the Churches infallibility. And whosoever shall but consider what I sayd in the last Number will have a ready answer to your question here *Why* doth *your Church take away from the people the use of Scripture.* Sir why doth your English Church in place of Scripture give them such damnably corrupted Scriptures? These Corruptions take indeed from them the use of Scripture, it being impossible for them to know what is uncorrupted, in such a Chaos of corruptions. *How miserably do you provide for the poor people?* In our manner of requiring that law from the Priests (which your own Translation saith the people *should* do) there is no more danger then in your taking the signification of a word in Scripture from the Publick consent of all men. Again, we permit the use of Scripture in such languages as a general council can judge of, because they be sufficiently understood by the Church Universal. Vulgar translations are incomparably more easily corrupted and their Corruptions unknown unto her. The Latine language is known to most well bred men in learning, To such others as are sober, stayed, and peaceable spirits the Church denyeth not the use of such Translations as their lawful local Prelates hold secure. Farther use of Scripture is an abuse and we both see and fell the sad effects of it. You, who so carpt at going to the Priests of the Church *for Knowledge of the law.* You I say, if you mark it, send all your people to your own Priests, as you call them, neither rightly ordained, nor Canonically licensed to preach. For to bid them go to the *English Bible*, is to bid them go to translations most corrupted

corrupted and authoriz'd only by your Ministers. To confer these Translations with the Originals they cannot do, no nor you neither. For you know not infallibly the true Originals. It is your own doctrine, *Translations are only known to be Gods word as far as they are known to agree with the Originals*: how far this is, you (not knowing the true Original) cannot tell. Of this you and all yours (who deny the Church infallible) are ignorant. And upon your word, who (how learned so ever) are ignorant of this, which only concerns them, they all in this highest matter must rely. I put this so fully with great reflection, because that Noble party (whose Champion you are) gave occasion to all our combating by carping at our blind obeying our Priest, and believing them, whereas all those of your Religion could go to the fountain. But alas! when that fountain, which they conceive themselves to drink to their eternal health is so poisened (as I shewed in the last Number) *that millions of millions* (as your own *Broughton* saith) *runne to Hell flames by occasion of this corruption*; And I may most truly say far more perish by mis-understanding (whilest they follow their Ministers, and their own private judgement of discretion) that which is truly Translated, then Perish by the corruption of that which is falsly Translated. Thus they perish for not hearing that Church, which their own Scripture bids them heare, whereas in doing that, which God biddeth, there can be no danger of errour, great or little. And you slander us when you say we bid the people require from the Priests mouth not the law of God but the doctrine of the Church. Sir, the doctrine of the Church is Gods law. And private Priests are far more likely to teach them Gods law by teaching them what the Universal Church holds to be Gods Law, then by teaching them what they themselves conceive to be Gods Law as you would have them do.

11 Now to prove further the Church to be a competent judge, guiding us no lesse securely then those many

millions were guided who had an infallible faith, and the *same Spirit of faith with us* as S. *Paul* said, though their faith were grounded on the authority of no Scripture, but wholy and intirely on the tradition of their infallible Church: I urged that in those two thousand years and more, before *Moses* did write the very first book of Scripture, the true faith of all the true believers of those Ages depended in its infallibility, upon their Churches being infallible in proposing the traditions she had received; shall we allow infallibility to that Church, and deny it to Christs Church? shall we be worse provided for in so main a point in the law of grace, then they were in the law of Nature? what text of Scripture is there for this? Then it was not written. Hear the Church, then it was not written that the *gates of Hell should not prevail against* her. Nor that *she was the Pillar and ground of truth*, that the *spirit of truth abided with her then, teaching her then all truth.* All this and far more then this (as I shall shew in this chapter) is written now of Christs Church. And yet you will say we are not sufficiently certified of her infallibility. I pray tell me how then were they certified (and infallibly certified of the infallibility of their Church?) How did Men then infallibly know that they were bound under pain of damnation to believe the tradition of that Church? shew me then what you demanded of me lastly to shew, that is *shew the ground they had then to hold their Church infallible*, and *the infallibility of the knowledge of it, and infallibly what was the subject of this infallibility.* If you cannot shew that they could not then do it better then we now, then refuse not to stand up to our Creed. Your answer to so convincing an argument is most unsatisfactory, and it would make a man think your intent were to plead against your self. You say this was *answered before it was written*, what was that answer? It was *that the word in substance of it was before the Church, which was begotten by it*; to this you add *that when there is now as much need, and as great certainty of tradition as formerly, then I may urge this argument?* so when you speak of the word of God

God, which you say was before *all writing*, and *which begot the Church*, you must speak of the unwritten word. This unwritten word is that very thing which we call tradition, and indeed when you speak of such a word as must be sufficient for an exterior, and an infallible direction for so many millions, as were by it onely to be directed in the way of Salvation before any Scripture was written, you must of necessity put this word outwardly expressed somewhere, and expressed in such a manner as may be able to produce this effect of guiding whole millions in the way of Salvation by an infallible beliefe of what God hath said by that word. Now I pray find me out any word of God any where existent before Scripture, but in the Orall Tradition of the Church of those times. You say, *Gods word revealed is the ground of all faith.* They then had faith, therefore they then had Gods word revealed, and revealed in a sufficient manner to ground divine faith, But they only had Gods word revealed by Tradition, Therefore Gods word revealed by tradition is a sufficient ground to ground divine faith. By this unwritten word, that is by this Tradition of the Church, she from a small Church (consisting of those very few, to whom God by his own mouth did first of all speak, or by his Angels) grew to be a multitude of true believers. And so the Church was begotten by Tradition, upon which only this multitude (that is the Church) did judge most prudently that to be the true word of God which was by so powerfull a motive perswaded to be so. That hence you may see, that, this very motive alone, is a very sufficient inducement to receive the Verities recommended by it, and to receive them with an infallible assent. For this was the only inducement which we know the true believers to have had for those 2000. years and more, which were before *Moses* did write the first book of Scripture. And those Scriptures which were written from the law of *Moses*, to the time of Christ, were only kept among the Iewes, and this time lasted two thousand yeares more, during which long time many among

among the Gentiles, as apeareth by *Job* and his friends, had true divine faith with out any knowledg of the Scripture wholy unknown unto them, this faith of theirs could have no other ground but Gods unwritten Word, delivered to them by Tradition; Therefore Gods unwritten Word, delivered by Tradition only, is a sufficient ground for infallible faith.

12 And whereas you add, That *when there is as much need and as great certainty of Traditions as formerly, then I may urge this argument*, I answer, that the need or necessity of Traditions, which you conceive to have been greater then now, doth not make the Traditions more credible. Those who have read very much in very many credible books of *France*, have no need at all of any unwritten and orall tradition to make them believe there is such a countrey as *France*, yet these men (whom we will suppose to live at *Dover*) doe as certainly know by unwritten or Orall Tradition of men daily coming from *France*, bringing *French* passengers, *French* commodities, and as to those who never read one word concerning *France*, not being able to read at all. And those who are not able to read at all, are not lesse assured by unwritten tradition, that there is such a Kingdome as *France*, because there be many books written of *France*, and the *French* warrs with the *English*: So though we have now the Scriptures written concerning most points of faith; we are not lesse helped by tradition because there be such books extant. And good Sir, consider how great our necessities are of both these helps; for even now when we have Scriptures and Traditions, we have ever had with them a perpetuall succession of horrible divisions opening still wider and wider; All commonly caused by the misinterpretation of the Scripture, to which inconvenience they were not subject before all Scripture was written. And therefore, in this respect there is now after the writing of the Scripture, a greater necessity then ever of Tradition, both to assure us which books

books be the word of God, which not, which be the true which the falſe Copies of theſe books? Where they be ſecure, where corrupted? And laſtly which is the true ſenſe of them and which not? For the ſenſe even in neceſſary matters, as I have ſhewed in the laſt Chapter, is far from being evident. Again Tradition doth of its own ſelfe naturally continue in its full force and vigour, after the ſame things are writen as well as it did before, as appears by what I juſt now ſaid of the unwritten traditions by which many men only know *France* or *Spain*, yea rather, the increaſing of it (by being divulged in writing by moſt credible and manifold Authors) doth very much ſtrengthen this former tradition, ſo far is it from taking any thing from it: wherefore God muſt purpoſely by a miracle have infringed the courſe of Nature (which no man can ſay he did) if the former Traditions of the Church (which before the writing of any Scripture did fully ſuffice alone to ground an infallible faith of ſuch and ſuch points, ſhould grow then to loſe their ſufficiency in order to the ſame effect, when they were ſtrengthned by ſo great an authority as that of the Sacred Writers was. Hence is confuted the opinion of Proteſtants, teaching the Authority of Traditions to have expired when the whole Canon of the Scripture was finiſhed, though not before: For which they have no Scripture at all. And if they go by reaſon, they are to ſay Tradition was rather more ſtrengthned, yea if they will not ſay this, yet conſequently they ſhould ſay that Tradition revived againe (at leaſt in part) when ſome part of the Canon was loſt, yet you ought not to ſay that Tradition expired at the finiſhing of the Canon, without it can be ſhewed that God did expreſſe this unto the Church ſo to undeceive thoſe many thouſands who had then reaſon to think that they might ſecurely build their beliefe upon that, upon which for about foure thouſand yeares, ſo many had untill that day built their faith. When Saint *Paul*, or any other Canonical writer preached

preached first that doctrine, which afterward he did write, did the beliefe of those thousands which was at first sufficiently grounded upon his preaching, come to lose its certainty, or rather to gain a new degree of certainty, when Saint *Paul* came afterward to write *that they must hold the Traditions he had delivered to them*, and *that though an Angel should come and teach them contrary to what they had received (by his Orall Tradition) they should account him Anathema.* And again, *Have thou a form of sound words which thou hast heard of me* 1. Tim. chap. 1. And again chap. 2. *the things which thou hast heard* (he saith not, read) of me by many *witnesses, these commend to faithfull men which shall be fit to teach others also.* Would the writing of such Scriptures make them think any force taken from Traditions, or rather make them conceive that Traditions are to be stood upon now more then ever before. Again, what wise man would put out one light, costing him nothing, because it will be shining of its own nature (unless you will needs have it hidden) because he hath now another light, but so that even with both these lights, many of his house-hold will still remain in darkness. But if you say *that if Scripture had not been given us we should have had a more certain Tradition given unto us*, I would know of you upon what account the Tradition of so Noble a Church as Christs Church is, should be of lesse credit or certainty, then the Tradition of that farre lesse Noble Church which was in the Law of Nature. What meanes had they then given by God to secure their Tradition for the space of 4000. years, which we want for the having secured our Traditions for these last 1654. yeares? This meanes you can by no means assigne, and therefore, by all means, you must grant the Traditions of this Nobler Church to have been as securely preserved from Corruption for these fewer yeares, as those Traditions of a farre lesse Noble Church, were preserved without corruption for above 4000 yeares. Again the Tradition of Christs primitive

2 Thess. 2.
1 Gal. 2.

Church

Church before the Scriptures were written, and ſufficiently promulged (which Tradition did by an infallible authority recommend all things) was to be believed upon her ſole authority, and ſo was the Tradition of the firſt Church before there was any Scripture, and therefore by good conſequence ſhe in the firſt place recómended herauthority to be believed as divine and infallible, and all the true believers believed it to be ſo, which they could not have done without God had ſaid ſo; for all divine beliefe reſteth upon the ſaying of God. God therefore ſaid (by that his Church) that her Traditions were infallible for her authority. Now if God ſaid this, ſhall we upon your fallible diſcourſe come to ſay the Church's Traditions are now no longer infallible though God ſaid they were ſo, and never yet expreſſed the ceaſing of their infallibility. By this you will ſee whether my Anſwer hath helped you, or your reply helped me concerning what will follow out of St. *Irenæus*.

13. For this ſerves for making good what I ſaid out of St. *Irenæus* ſo farre as he is a witneſs (which a profane author might have been) of what hapned ſo near his times. For as for his authority, as he is a moſt grave Father of the Church and a moſt believing that to be true which he commended to writing as moſt true, I doe not preſſe it againſt you. Yet becauſe here you thank St. *Irenæus* for his teſtimony, and make a ſhew as if it were for you (though you cannot invent the means by which Tradition ſhould have ben conveighed more certainly ſuppoſing there had been no Scripture), I could not but obſerve how ſo ſoon as you have hugged him, you caſt him off again with ſmall reſpect, when you ſay *Neither can we believe that thoſe barbarous Nations did rely only upon Tradition, They might be commended to the doctrine of the Goſpel by Tradition and then not believe it for the ſake of Tradition.* How flatly be theſe your words againſt St. *Irenæus* who clearly declareth all himſelfe to tell us upon what ground *we muſt have been*

*obliged to believe, though the Apoſtles had never written any Scriptures at all: What* (ſaith he) *if the Apoſtles had not left us the Scriptures, muſt we not have followed that order of Tradition which they delivered to thoſe, to whoſe Charges they left the Church to be governed? To this order of tradition by the unwritten word many barbarous Nations do aſſent, who have believed in Chriſt without any writings, keeping diligently the ancient Traditions.* What bringeth he this example of theſe Barbarous Nations for, but to ſhew that we might with divine faith believe upon the ſole account of that very tradition which the Apoſtles *de facto* left to thoſe to whom they left the Churches goverment, *although the Apoſtles had never written at all at any time?* He therefore was none of thoſe who would ſay with you *neither can we believe that thoſe barbarous Nations did rely only upon traditions*; For if they had relied upon any things elſe in their beliefe, their example had bin nothing to his purpoſe to ſhew what we ſhould have done when we had only Tradition to rely upon.

14. As for arguing about Tradition I went no Further then to ſhew, that the Tradition of the Church teſtifying her own infallibility (in propoſing for Gods word that which ſhe delivereth us (for Gods Word) as worthy of an infallible aſſent in this point. And the examples I bring, prove this. Now if this point be once aſſented unto with an infallible aſſent, it draweth by unevitable Conſequence the like aſſent to all other points, which by the ſame authority are teſtified to be likewiſe delivered as Gods Word; Or elſe you muſt be forced to ſay that it is in our power to aſſent to this authority as divine in all things it delivers as Gods Word, and yet to deny it in ſome things which it delivers as Gods word, which is a plain contradiction. Well then if upon this preſuppoſed authority as infallible, I believe the Church delivering ſuch and ſuch points by her doctors and teachers, which be points never written; then it is manifeſt I believe her in other points

points then those which were then written, & so I may with as good reason believe her now upon her own authority, testifying other points then those which are written. Whence you see all I say holdeth good *even in Traditions of proper name which we say are besides that which is written.* I cannot conclude more opposite to you then with your own words here *P. 73. Tradition in matters of faith unwritten is of equall authority to Scripture.* The Traditions we stand upon be matters of faith truly once revealed by our Saviour or his Apostles, though this revelation were not written by them; Therefore this is of equall authority to Scripture even according to your own words.

15 I going on to prove yet further that Christ intended to guide us not by the Scripture only, but cheifly by his Church, used this argument *Neither the Apostles nor their Successors took any care to have the Scripture communicated to all Nations in such languages as all, or the greater part of them could understand. You* answer; *they did take care that the new Testament should be written in Greek.* Then you being still to prove that Greek was understood by all, or the greater part of the world, your only proof of this is only out of *Tully*; saying, *Graeca per totum Orbem leguntur*, Greek is read though the whole World, and so is *Virgil* in latin. But neither the one nor the other is to be understood in a sense making to our purpose; for both these sayings are only true thus, that the more learned sort of men every where read Greek, and *Virgil*. And these words of *Tully* being delivered in on Encomiasticall Oration *(pro Archia)* may truely be said to be spoken by way of a Notable amplification. And either this must be confessed, or Scripture denied. For it is evident out of Scripture. That the Vulgar language of diverse Nations situated, even between that place we call *Constantinople*, and the Citty of *Antioch*, in which a man would suppose the *Greek language* farre more common, then in the more Western or any *Northern*, or Southern places, yet I say even between those

two Cities of *Antioch* (where the ſame *Tully* ſaith, *Archias* was born and ſtudied) and *Conſtantinople*, the *Greek* tongue was not the Vulgar language *of Pontus*, *Cappadocia*, *Aſia* minor, *Phrygia*, *Pamphilia*, all which Nations the Scripture (*Act.* 2.) teſtifieth to have had different languages. Within that compaſſe is alſo *Galatia* which *Saint Hierome* teſtifieth to have had a language ſomewhat like thoſe of *Trevers*. If nations ſo neere *Greece* had not the Vulgar uſe of that language, but that tongue had ſo ſmall a compaſſe even *in Aſia*, and ſome few *Eaſtern parts of Europe*, all other parts of *Europe* and whole *Africa* uſing Vulgarly other Tongues, how ſhort do you fall of proving that Greek was underſtood by the greater part of the World? And if this cannot be proved, then I ſaid truly that though the *Apoſtles writ the new Teſtament in Greek, yet they, did not take any care to have it communicated to all Nations in ſuch Languages, as they could all, or the greater part underſtand.* For all, or the greater part could not underſtand Greek; call here to mind how lowd you uſe to cry out againſt us for uſing our Common prayer in Lattin, though Lattin be ſo common among all well bred people. And yet our Cõmon prayer is a thing only offered to God by the Prieſts (who underſtand what they ſay) for the people. But the New Teſtament contains (as you ſay) the only neceſſary groũd of faith, faith neceſſary to ſalvation. But the falſity of this your ſaying is convinced by the Apoſtles taking no care (neither read we of any care taken for many yeares after their times) to communicate the whole Canon of Scripture to the ſeverall converted Nations in their ſeveral tongues; I pray name me the time when the Scripture can be firſt ſhewed to have bin thus communicated to the people of ſo ſeverall languages? You will ſweat for ſome hundred yeares before you can find this either done or effectually deſired to be done. They know the tongue could ſufficiently deliver Gods Word to the people, and that Orall Tradition joyned to dayly profeſſion, practiſe would abundantly ſuffice for the infallible delivery of Gods Word. 16. You

16. You move the question *how the people should clearly know the true tradition from the false?* I answer *first* they could know this better then know true Scripture from false, for they could not do that, but by knowing first the true Tradition recommending the true Scriptures from the Tradition recommending false. *Again*, after Christ they could do this as well (and better) then their forefathers for many hundreds of years, yea for two thousand, yea for twice two thousand yeares together. Reflect a little upon the efficacy of Tradition, joyned with perpetual profession, and answerable practice dayly occurring. For example. The Apostles by onely unwriting Tradition did clearly, undeniably teach the *baptizing of Children, prayer for the faithfull departed.* This Tradition from hence came to be Professed as true doctrine by all the first Christians, and conformably hereunto, they in all places baptized their Children, in all places they prayed for the faithfull departed. Nothing more common then being born: every one that is born dieth: whence dayly was the practice of baptizing infants and yet more dayly the practice of praying for the dead, because they baptize infants but once, but they pray often for the same man who is dead. Will we suppose these two traditions are called in question concerning the truth of them. And let us suppose this to be done (as it was done) in the last age. Learned men looking in Records of their own and all other Countries, will find every where Christnings, and every where prayers for the dead, all inscriptions of graves, all wills and testaments, all foundations of pious places will testifie this custome farre more strongly then that of Baptisme, yea in no one countrey nor in any one age since Christ (untill this last following age) did ever any one man deny praying for the dead, except *Aerius* counted for this his opinion an *Heretick* by St. *Austin* and by St. *Epiphanius* as you know very well. Hence it is made evidently credible to any learned man that this Tradition of baptizing Infants, and much more the Tradition of praying for

t be-

the dead, came to us from the Apostles; it not being possible for all true believers, in so many severall countries, and so many severall ages, to agree in the profession and daily practice of this truth, without they had received these two things joyntly with their first faith, else the novelty and the authors of such a novelty, would in some time or some place, have been made known to posterity, for no one mans worke was it, no, nor no one hundred mens worke, to bring all men, every where, to any such novelty with so unanimous and no where contradicted consent. The Ignorant people will have the truth of these Traditions also made evidently credible unto them by the publick, unanimous and universal consent of all antient men and all Ancient Monuments and also the like unanimous affirmation of all learned men of any standing, who will all and every where profess themselves assured of it, by their Learning and certain knowledge of those Traditions proved in the manner I now said. This maketh the matter evidently credible to the ignorant. Wherefore they should do most imprudently not to believe that these points came from the Apostles, and then supposing that they came from them, they should do a damnable sin not to believe them. Can any rationall man desire a more rational proceeding? How many true believers commended in Scripture, cannot give so prudent a reason for what they believed? How we proceeding thus escape clearly all Circle I told you the last Chapter. Numb. 31.32. Now as you must grant that our Church (submitted unto as infallible) presently by her authority decides all controversies; so her Traditions once acknowledged as infallible, will decide the points questioned. The Scripture never so clear can never decide any one controversie untill it be first acknowledged. Thus you see the two things which you here desired to see.

17. After this I passed to another quality which the Church hath, and the Bible hath not, though it be a quality

lity primely necessary to decide all controversies, whence it appeareth that God intended not the Bible but the Church to be our judge. This quality is, that the Church is a living judge who can be informed of all Controversies arising from time to time, and who can hear me and you, and be heard by me & you so manifestly, that neither I nor you can doubt of the true meaning of this Church, or if we do doubt we can propose our doubts and she will explicate her meaning. Such a living judge as this we must have to put effectually an End to all Controversies that can arise. And as for the Bible I have shewed that it doth not decide all points necessary to Salvation, the Bible heareth not new Controversies arising, as I prove by this clear example. An *Arrian* standeth up (as really he did) and saith that these words of the Scripture, *These three are one* are words added by us to the true Scripture. This Controversie and a thousand such like the Bible heareth not; the Bible judgeth not, for there is not a word of it in all the Bible. And though you say you can see true Scripture by its light, you shall never get any man to believe that you your selfe do really believe that you see every verse in Scripture, by its light. No, light appeareth so dimm as these words appear to man. *Three are one.* Yet besides this light you (who reject Church Tradition as fallible) you I say, have left you no other infallible ground, nor any infallible meanes to convince the Arrian, untill you hold the Church infallible. All other use which you say you make of the (Church) sufficeth not to ground an infallible assent, for when all comes to all, you make any private man, and consequently every Arrian Cobler (as I shewed) the last Court of Judicature in giving the finall sentence, on which all depends. For he must be the last judge, who after the Churches judgement, must give sentence that she hath, or hath not judged against Scripture. That you may see my argument is not peccant; I will frame both the Premisses and the Conclusion thus. Faith being an infallible assent,

assent, Controversies concerning faith cannot be determined so as to end them effectually, but by an infallible living judge who can hear you and me, and be heard by you and me. But no other then the Church, can (with any ground) be held to be this living judge; Therefore She must be held to be this judge. I doe not without Reason put in my Premisses the terme of infallible, for faith being an infallible assent, must needs require an infallible authority to rest upon. This Authority she must find in all points to which she is bound to give this assent. But she is bound to give this assent to diverse points not proposed clearly in Scripture as I showed the last Chapter. Therefore she is bound to give this assent to diverse of these points onely, because they are proposed by the Church, to which she could not possibly be bound to give an infallible assent, without due assurance of her infallibility.

48 You object that the Church Traditions cannot hear you and me. I answer that it is the Church who propoſeth these Traditions, and not the Traditions which are our judge, you ask me whither *an Heretike be not condemned by himselfe* as Saint *Paul* saith, and you interpret his saying, so that he must needs be condemned by himselfe, for no other reason, but because he had in him the principles of the word of God, which he gain-said by his contrary error, and so he was condemned thereby, and therefore that can Judge. Sir he is not an *Heretike* but an infidel who is told by his own Conscience, that he gain-saith the Scripture. All christians are readier to die then to disbelieve any one saying of the Scripture. When St. *Paul* writ those words, the whole Canon of the Scripture was not written, and until the whole Canon was written your own Doctors grant the Church to have ben the infallible judge of Controversies. And I wonder you should say, *the Church at the writing of this by St. Paul was not sufficiently formed*, which the same St. *Paul* testifieth to have been formed before his conversion, accusing himselfe for having *above measure persecuted* the

*the Church of God.* And before his converſion, *the Number of the diſciples was multiplied*, Act. 6. yea Act. 8. *Simon Magus* was turned *Heretick* before St. *Paul* was turned Chriſtian, or any word of the new Scripture was writen. The meaning of St. *Paul* is that an *Heretick* might, if he would, clearly ſee his private doctrine to be oppoſite to the known publick Doctrine of the Church, which Church then ſhined with the glory of infinite Miracles, ſtupendious converſions, and moſt eminent Sanctity, and was then formed moſt completely with all things neceſſary to infallible direction to the true faith. Yea you will ſay ſhe was then more completely furniſhed to that end then ever ſhe was ſince that time.

49. Now becauſe your cheif exception againſt the Churches being our judge, is that you hold her not infallible, beſides all the proofs I have already brought of her infallibility, I ſhall now add divers more. But in the firſt place I muſt a little more fully tell you what we underſtand by the name of the Church: He who is a ſeeker of his Religion muſt firſt believe the Univerſal Church diffuſed to be furniſhed by God with true infallible meanes to direct us ſecurely in all doubts of faith, wherefore he moſt prudently judgeth himſelfe bound to joyne himſelfe to her in faith, being convinced that ſhe directed moſt ſecurely in faith. Being thus alſo a ſeeker reſolved to ioyne to theſe true believers. When he proceedeth further to take a particular account in whom this infallible meanes (given to the Church Univerſal) of directing all ſecurely in matters of faith doth conſiſt, he will readily find that it doth not conſiſt in all the members of the Univerſal Church, for Children and women be of the Church, and yet their Vote (in no mans opinion) is required to the deciding any controverſie in faith, the Laiety alſo hath no deciſive Voice in thoſe points, nor every inferiour Clergy man, but only ſuch as are Prelates, Overſeers and Governors over the reſt. So that in fine this infallible direction is Unani-

 mouſly

mouſly affirmed by us all, to be undoubtedly ſettled upon the authority of the prime Paſtors & Prelats of the Church aſſembled together in a lawfull generall Councell, with their cheife Paſtor and Head the Biſhop of Rome: Againſt a thing ſo eaſily to be underſtood you cry out aloud of ſtrange intricateneſſe and inextricable proceedings. And yet I think moſt clowns of this Land did eaſily underſtand what was meant by a decree of the Kingdome, to the which the conſent of King and Kingdome aſſembled in Parliament (as the cuſtome was for many years together) was required. Now what more difficulty is there to know what we meane by a decree, or Definition of the Church; The kingdome repreſentative was the king and the Parliament, The Church repreſentative is the cheife Biſhop with the full Aſſembly of the other Biſhops in a lawful Council; the Decrees, and definitions of which aſſembly be the decrees and definition of the Church. In a thing ſo cleare you labour your uttermoſt to raiſe a thick miſt.

50. Firſt you obiect *who can be certain by a divine faith of the lawfulnes and Regularity of a Pope in his firſt creation.* I anſwer that when I ſpeake of a Pope defining in a lawfull Councel (as I do now ſpeak) I ſpeak of ſuch a Pope to whom the Church ſubmitted in calling the Councel, and whom the Church admitteth as her lawful head to preſide in the Councel, Theſe very acts ſupply all defects in his election and do make it *evidently credible* that he is the true head who thus admitted defined with the Councel as their acknowledged head. *Secondly* you aſk *when there was Pope againſt Pope, who of the people could diſtinguiſh the right Pope.* I anſwer, that he ſhall ever be eſteemed the right Pope to whom the Prelates of the Church ſhall unanimouſly obey, when he calleth them to meet in a general Councel, and in this Councel to preſide over them. To to have two ſuch Popes, as theſe are, at one time is impoſſible. And this is the only time in which a Pope defineth with

a lawful Councel. What you ſay of Popes not defining in ſuch a Councel is not our Caſe put me a Pope defining with a lawful Councel and then prove him fallible if you can. Whether the Popes definitions out of a Councel be fallible or infallible maketh nothing to this purpoſe. Only this is evident if they be infallible out of a Councel, they be infallible in a Councel. *Thirdly* you think that no Controverſies *can* (*in* our opinion) be *decided when there is a doubt who is true Pope.* And you aſk *who is then to call a Councel.* And when the Councel is called you think us to think that this Councel can define nothing without a Pope. I doubt not Sir but you have found a clear anſwer to all this in *Bellarm lib. 2. de Concilis Chap. 19.* that although a Councel without a Pope cannot define any article of faith, yet in time of ſchiſme it can judge which is true Pope, and provide the Church of a true Paſtor if ſhe had none, who thus provided by the Councels authority, may diſſolve the Councel if he pleaſeth or if he pleaſe to have them remaine aſſembled, they remaine ſo now by his authority, and can define as well as other Councels called by the Pope. In that meeting in which the Pope was to be choſen, or declared the undoubted Pope, the Prelats of the Church might and ought to meet upon their own authority, and aſſemble themſelves. *Fourthly you aſk how we can by divine faith come to be aſſured of the lawfulnes and generality of Councels, for Councels have been called by Emperours not by Popes;* Sir your Church which never had, nor ſhall have generall Councel, is to ſeeke in all things belonging to them. Our Church almoſt in every age ſince *Conſtantine* hath been viſibly aſſembled in general Councels, and by perpetual practice hath been ſufficiently informed to deliver (by the aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt) all that ſhe hath received from her anceſtors to be eſſential to a true Councel, and to deliver this point infallibly. To your obiection in order I anſwer, *firſt*, That it is out of Scripture evident that there is no divine inſtitution by which either Empe-

rours be assured to be still found in the world, or that, when they have that dignity, they be by divine institution invested with a power to call Councels. We seek for this divine Institution. This we will not admit until it can be shewed in Scripture or Tradition, the fact of calling, sheweth not divine Institution. *Secondly* as for the Prelates of the Church we can shew divine Institution, *Act.* 20. 28. *Bishops placed by the Holy Ghost over all the flock to feed or govern the Church of God.* And 4. Epho. Not lay Magistrates but only Ecclesiastical are said to *be given us by Christ, for the work of the Ministery for the edifying of the body of Christ, that henceforth we may not be carried about with every wind of doctrine* &c. *Thirdly,* The Emperour, is not by divine Institution Lord of the Christian world. No nor of any considerable part of it. Wherefore seeing that a motive power is no motive power any further then it can, or ought to be able to motive, the Emperiall power, which cannot move further then it reigneth, nor ought not to move further, cannot consequently command any further then his territory at the uttermost. The power of the cheife Pastor of the Universal Church is coextended to the Universal Church. All Bishops of the Universal being to be moved, must be moved by such a power as this is. If Emperours called councils it was not by an Ecclesiastical calling, such an one as the Pope called them by at the very selfe same time, but the Emperours calling was only political, proceeding from a temporal power, subserving to the Ecclesiastical, and not able to force them by censure in case of refusing to come, as the Ecclesiastical power could, which power implored the Emperiall assistance to concurre with her, only for the more effectual excution. Perhaps somtimes Emperours might venture to call, dependently of the ratification of the supreme Pastor which they presumed would be assuredly obtained in so just necessities as there seemed to presse for a speedy meeting. If Emperors were present in Councels it was only by

by their preſence and good countenance to honor, encourage, and further the proceedings of the Councel, and to paſſe their Vote in points of beliefe. You add ſomething elſe now but it comes again preſently. *Fifthly* you object, *How ſhall we know that every one of the Councel hath a free election to it, and a free deciſive Vote in it?* I anſwer the freedome of every mans calling is made evidently credible by the publick ſũmons ſent throughthe whole Chriſtianworld obeyed by the ſame without any pertinatious oppoſition, and the anſwerable publick apperance from all parts of the world every one exhibiting the publickely authenticated teſtimony of his election, and confirmation. If any man be excluded he may (without he will renounce his right) be heard in the Councel, which being a publick hearing, the matter cannot but be known. Many yet never were, nor can be thus injured without making their injury notorious by publik proteſtations and ſuch like remedies alwayes uſed againſt unjuſt excluſion, or hinderance of liberty in Voting. If the Councel be known notoriouſly to uſe ſuch procedings we are not to acknowledg it for a lawfull Councel. Again as private mens proceedings are not to be judged bad unleſs they can be proved to be ſo, much leſſe ought the proceedings of the Church repreſentative to be judged bad without ſufficient proof of the contrary. And when ſuch evident and notorious ill proceedings are not apparent, nothing can be ſolidly objected againſt the lawfulneſs of the Councel. And therefore it being to be admitted as a lawfull Councel, it belongeth to the Holy Ghoſt to provide that their diſinitions be not prejudiciall to the Church put under his protection, and direction. You only look what the inward nature of humane malice might act, but you ſhould alſo look to the extrinſical overruling providence promiſed by God againſt humane malice, and weakneſs. This is that which maketh all theſe factions, and bandings, and domineering ſelf intereſt never to be effectually deſtructive of that ſecure direction pro-

promiſed by God to his Church. Though hell gates ſhould be ſet wide open they ſhould not prevaile againſt her. *Sixthly* you ask *how ſhall ignorant people be divinely perſwaded that the Councel is general?* I anſwer, the publick Summons to the Councel ſent through the Chriſtian world, The Publick appearance of Prelats made upon theſe ſummons from all parts of the world, Their publick ſitting, publick ſubſcribing, publick divulging their decrees and definitions, acknowledged truly to be theirs by all preſent, denied by no man to be theirs with the leaſt ſhew of probability, no more then ſuch an Act is denied to be the Act of ſuch a Parliament. All theſe motives, I ſay, maketh it *evidently credible* to the ignorant and to the learned that this is the true definition of the Church. Now this being *evidently credible* to be her definition, and I believing by divine faith, all her definitions to be true. I alſo believe this definition amongſt the reſt to be true. It is a great ſigne you are ill furniſhed with ſtrong arguments, when you would perſwade us that in things ſo eaſy to be known there be ſuch inſuperable difficulties. The Councel of *Trents* definitions concerning faith were never oppoſed by *France*, though ſome things ordained for practice ſeemed leſſe ſutable to the particular ſtate of that Kingdome, yet this difficulty was at laſt removed. *Seventhly* you ask *how many Biſhops in the Trent Councel were furniſhed with a title to over-power the reſt for the Popes ends.* I pray Sir, tell me how many. But tell me by credible witneſſes (ſuch as are their own ſubſcriptions) who can aſſure me of this truth; And when you have told me this, give me leave to aske what one of them was as much as ſuſpected to be of a faith different from the reſt. If they differed not in faith from the reſt, how then can the Pope be ſuſpected to have acted againſt faith by making ſuch Biſhops. Again doth the making of ſuch Biſhops make the holy Ghoſt unable to order things ſo in the councel that nothing ſhall happen deſtructive of the ſecure direction undertaken to be afforded for

for ever by him. *Saul* ſhall ſooner turn a Prophet, and *Caiphas* ſhall prophecie not knowing what he doth, before the ſpirit of truth, ſent to teach the Church all truth, ſhall faile in his duty. *Eighthly* you ask *how the Church was provided for when for ſo many yeares there was no Pope defining with a Councel?* This time you mean was the firſt three hundred years after Chriſt, when for perſecution no Councel could be gathered. All this time the known doctrine of the Apoſtles remained ſo freſh, and ſo notorious by the Tradition of the Church diffuſed, and there remained alſo ſo Univerſal a reſpect and obedience to the cheife Biſhop of the Church notoriouſly known to be the upholder of true doctrine, that the Church wanted not meanes to decide Controverſies as farre as the neceſſity of thoſe times required: whence the *Quartodecimani* although they oppoſed nothing ſet down clearly in Scripture, were Iudged Heretikes for oppoſing the doctrine of the firſt Church made evidently known by freſh Tradition. Now as the Church could want Councils for ſo many years, ſo it could want Councils for the ſhort ſpace of ſchiſm. For the neceſſity of new declarations it not ſo frequent at leaſt in any high degree of neceſſity, calling for inſtant remedy, and a remedy of this nature only, Scripture alone, you ſay will remedy this neceſſity. We beſides ſcripture have alwayes at hand, the many definitions of former Councils, and the known Traditions of the Church, which alone ſerved Gods Church in thoſe two thouſand yeares before Scripture, and for two thouſand yeares more ſerved the faithful amongſt the Gentiles who had not the Scriptures, which remained almoſt ſolely and alone to the Iewes. *Ninthly* you ask *if the Pope and Council do differ at any time about ſome queſtion, what ſhall be defined?* I anſwer nothing ſhall be defined becauſe this eſſential hinderance manifeſteth no definition of ſuch a particular queſtion, to it at that time neceſſary for the preſervation of the Church; for if this depended upon ſuch a preſent definition, the Holy Ghoſt whom

(whom you still forget) would not forget to inspire the parties requisite to do their duties. Tenthly you ask *how my opinion stands with theirs who affirm the government of the Church to be Monarchicall by Christs institution.* I answer our government in *England* was Monarchical this last five hundred years, and yet our Monarchs could not do all things without a Parliament. Again those who make the Pope sufficiently assisted to define all alone, cannot possibly deny what I say, to wit, that he is sufficiently assisted when he defineth with a Councel. *Eleventhly*, you ask, *How many* (general) *Councells have been opposite to one another.* I answer. Not so much as one. You ask again, *in which or with which did he not erre.* I answer, he neither erred in or with any. In the *Nicene* he erred not, as you will grant, nor in the three next General Councels, as your Church of England grants. He subscribed not in the Councel of *Ariminum*, how then did he erre in it? yea because he subscribed not, that Councel is never accounted lawful by any but *Arrians*; or if your *English* Church accounted that a lawful Councel, they must admit that, whilest they admit the first foure Councels. So that I am amazed to see a learned man four or five times object the contrariety of the Councel of *Ariminum* to the Councel of *Nice*, to prove from thence that two lawful general Councels can be opposite to one another, you knowing well that this Councel of *Ariminum* was no lawful Councel, the cheif Bishop and head of the Church not subscribing in it. Tell mee I pray, if by all your great reading, you can find one single Holy Father who did ever censure any one general Councel of doctrine, in any one point either false, or opposite to any former lawful general Councel. In what age then live we, which licenseth every Mechanical fellow, freely to tax the Councels of all ages of errours against Scripture. This is the fruit of crying out *in what Councel or with what Councel did not the Pope erre. Twelfthly*, you ask me (I pray see my 12. Number above, fine) *did ever*

*any*

*any of the ancient councels determine of their own infallibility.* I answer the ancienteſt councel of all ſaid, *Viſum eſt Spiritui Sancto & nobis, It ſeemed good to the Holy Ghoſt and us.* Could any thing fallible ſeem good to the Holy Ghoſt? Or to a council lawfully aſſembled in the holy Ghoſt, as all lawful councils were ever ſuppoſed by themſelves to be: and upon this ground they ever aſſumed an authority ſufficient not only to be ſecurely followed by the whole Church in their definitions, but denounced an *Anathema* to the rejectors of their definitions; which had been wickedly done if there might have been errours in faith. The moſt bloudy perſecution of tyrants could not have been halfe ſo pernitious to the Church, as it was thus to be taught, and compelled by the unanimous authority of Chriſtendome, to embrace that as Catholick doctrine, which is an errour in faith. And ſurely a practice ſo Univerſal, ſo frequent, and yet ſo pernitious, would have been cried out upon over and over again, by the moſt zealous and learned ancient Fathers, who notwithſtanding never opened their mouthes againſt this proceding of councils which could not be juſtifiable. For this proceeding of ſetling a court of ſo great authority, and an everlaſting Court to be called in matters of greateſt moment until the end of the world, ſo to teach the world in all ages the Catholick truth, in greateſt points, if in place of this truth, errors againſt faith could have been perpetually obtruded even to the whole world, and that with the greateſt authority in the world; and this under pain of being cut off from the body of Chriſt; imagin if you can a thing more pernitious then this. And yet this was the proceeding of all antiquity if the Church were fallible as you ſay. *Thirtenthly* you aſk me *what I think of Nazianzens opinion about councels in his Ep. to Procopius* the 12 as you ſay, but I find it in the 42. Sir I think if what you have ſaid, againſt the proof of any point out of the General conſent of Fathers, be true; no ſingle proof, brought from ſome one of them, can have any force out of your mouth, what force ſoever it might have had out

of a Mouth used to speak otherwise of them. But you are pressing & asking, *shall I tell you*, yes Sir tell me. Yet let me tell you that what he saith will be nothing to the purpose unles he can be shewed to speak of a lawful free General Councel called, and directed by the chiefe Pastor of the Church presiding in it: now Sir tell me, doth he speak of such a councel? His words are, *I am thus affected as to shun all meetings of Bishops*, (if I must speak the truth) *for I never saw any good end of a Synod, nor that had an end of evils more then an addition.* Sir you much wrong this grave Father if you think he speaketh of such councils as I now mentioned. Before his speaking these words there had been but one such council, to wit, that of *Nice*. Let us hear from himself his opinion of this one councel out of those Treatises which goe just before his Epistles, which you might have read as well as them. In the first of these Treatises being asked the most *certain doctrine of faith*; He answereth that it is *that which was promulgated by the Holy Fathers* at *Nice, & that he never did prefer nor was able to prefer any thing before* it, so He Tract. 50. And in his next Treatise he explicates this faith at large. And in the end he saith *he doth imbrace the treatise of this council to the uttermost power of his mind, knowing it opposed with invincible verity against all Heretiocks*, and in his Orations to Saint *Athanasius* he sayeth, *The Fathers of this council were gathered by the Holy Ghost.* Saint *Gregory* then, who speaketh thus, had the same spirit that the other Saint Gregory (the great) who said, *I doe professe my selfe to reverence the first fower councils as I reverence the fower bookes of the Gospel. And in this manner do I reverence the fift council. Whosoever is of another mind let him be an Anathema, l. 1 Epistol. Ep. prope finem.* He then who thus reverenced lawful general councils, did not doubtles speak the former words concerning them. But did he perhaps speak them of lawful particular Councils? No, how then? It was hard fortune to live in a time, in which the Arrians had so great power that they disturbed the lawful proceedings of several particular councils.

Hence

Hence the councils of *Seleucum*, *Tirus*, *Ariminũ*, *Millan*, *Smyrna*, came to unfortunate concluſions, rather encreaſing then leſſening the former evils. Neither were the times ſo altered that there appeared any great likelyhood that in thoſe parts, any better concluſion could be expected of that council to which he was called, when he writ that Epiſtle. So alſo Saint *Baſil* (his boſom friend) writing at that time to Saint *Athanaſius* Ep. 52. ſaid *He thought it impoſſible for a General Council to be aſſembled in thoſe* times. Clear then it is that Saint *Gregory* ſpoke only of ſuch councils as had lately been held and could be held in thoſe daies, in which the Arrians would be ſure to croſſe all that might be good and to make thoſe *particular meetings* patronize their cauſe. What you further ſpeak of a private Biſhop of *Bitonto* telling the Fathers of the council of Trent to their face, *of their falling with one conſent from Religion to ſuperſtition, from Faith unto infidelity, from Chriſt unto Antichriſt, from God to Epicurus*, is a thing I never yet did read in any credible Hiſtorian; And I dare ſay never any credible Hiſtorian, from Chriſts time until that time, ever could find ſuch a ſaucy ſpeech to relate in Hiſtory, uſed as yet by any modeſt, or immodeſt Catholicke to the face of a Councel. And can you put on a forehead to countenance ſuch a ſpeech, not having any one example from Chriſts time to this day as I ſaid? So it is. The Catholikes and onely the *Roman* Catholikes have been the men who were ſtill imployed in upholding the authoritie of councils of Fathers, and you cannot (I ſay it again and again) find an example from Chriſts time unto this age, of any who were not known Hereticks, who were carping at the authority of councils or Fathers. You ſpoke full enough before of the Fathers. I think you have not wanted much of doing your worſt againſt councels, although you ſaid in another place, *In what do we oppoſe Councels?* and you would ſeem to acknowledge them the higheſt Tribunal on earth, though ſo much be ſaid,

for their vilification. And when you have cried down the authority of Fathers & patronized the reprochful language of this private Man againſt a whole council, of what authority do you think this one private mans ſaying could be?

21. Hence you ſee how little all this ſerveth for an anſwer of what yet is to be anſwered in the 21 Number of my former paper, ſpecially when I ſhall have added the other proofs which I have of the aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt promiſed to his Church. Of this by and by. Now you invite me to re-examin the Determinations of the council of *Trent*. It appeareth by what I ſaid Chap. 2. Num. 4. 5. 6. 7. *That it is fine doctrine that determinations of councils ſhould be examined by ſuch as I and you are.* Have we ſuch aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt as councils have? Have we halfe the authority, or any thing like one quarter of even the wit and learning which they have? Sir, Let us two ſet down and examine how true this is which I ſhall now ſay. Either the determinations of General Councils be ſuch as are evidently againſt clear Scripture, or the Texts which we think they gain-ſay be not evident to the contrary, which if they be not, it would be a wonderful imprudence in me, and you, to think we ſhould ſurer hit right upon the meaning of obſcure places in Scripture then the whole council hath done. But now if the places alledgeable againſt the councils be evidently cleare Texts, do you think to perſwade any pious and prudent Man, that ſo very many (and many of them ſo very eminent for piety and for prudence) as are known to have ſubſcribed to ſo many General Councils, not to have been able to ſee that which hath been evidently ſet down before all their Eyes in clear Scripture? God give us Humility. God give us charity. God have mercy upon us in the bitter day of his Iudgment, if we paſſe ſo bitter a Iudgment againſt the whole Church repreſentative. And yet if you paſſe not this bitter Iudgment, you will never paſſe this objection without being poſed.

22 Good

22. Good Sir, what mean you here to bid me ſay no more of this point (concerning the Holy Ghoſt giving to his Church an aſſiſtance reaching to infallibility,) but you would have me now meaſure the infallibility of our councils or Churches by their determinations, and to ſee how they agree with Scripture. *Let us not* (ſay you) *ſee your opinions by infallibility but your infallibility by your determinations ſet forth by your Church.* Remember Sir, what you find in the 7 Number of this chapter where you undertake to inſtruct me in the right way of diſputing, according to which I ſhould not ſtand ſhewing the Churches determinations to be ſuch as ſhould be obeyed, but I ſhould ſhew *à priori* (as they ſay) that ſhe is infallible and that therefore her definitions are to be admitted. Now when I come to do what you would have me to do, you cry out, ſay no more of this point, but go now the other way, caſt the weight of this argument upon the other ſhoulder. It galleth me upon this. Sir, by your good leave I muſt dwell upon this argument yet a great while, The more it preſſeth the better it is.

23. This I will do by paſſing to my 22. Number, where firſt you ſtumble, and then tread upon *Luther*. Let him ly where you will. He is no better then his Fathers. I ſtep over him: and ſo prove this infallibility of the Church. I cite Saint *Paul, Tim.* 3. 15. calling *the Church of the living God the pillar and ground of Faith. May not all ſecurely in their faith, rely upon the pillar of Truth? May they not moſt groundedly ground themſelves upon the ground of Truth it ſelf?* You anſwer, *There is a double pillar, and a double ground, one principal, the Scripture, the other leſs principal and ſubordinate, the Church.* But this double dealing in diſtinguiſhing helpeth you not. The Church muſt ſtill be a true pillar, and a true ground of Truth. The people *believed God and Moſes*, ſaith the Scripture. *Moſes* was infinitely under God, yet this hindred not his being truly ſuch a pillar of Truth as was to be relied upon ſecurely in matters of Faith. I apply

Of my 22th. Number.

apply all to *Moſes* in reſpect of God, what you apply to the Scripture in reſpect of the Church. And yet after all this as they might rely upon *Moſes* as a pillar of Truth, ſo we upon the Church. All true believers for two thouſand years before the writing of Scripture had no other ground to ſtand upon but this Church, the ground of Truth. And therefore a ground ſure enough, and yet not ſure enough if fallible. Yea, the true believers to whom Saint *Paul* did write theſe words. *The Church is the pillar and ground of Truth*, had not the whole Canon of the Scripture, which collectively taken maketh your other ground of Chriſtian belief to ſtand upon; therefore Saint *Pauls* words were ſpoken of the Church as of ſuch a pillar of truth, and ſuch a ground of truth, as might then be ſecurely relied upon in all matters of faith; and confeſſedly as then the true believers had not the Scriptures ſufficiently compleated to be their adæquate Rule of Faith. Now after the writings of theſe, Scripture recommending the Church *as the pillar and ground of Truth*, this ground was ſo far from growing weaker, that the confirmation of Scripture added new force to it. I have now ſhewed you the Text, in which without any ſubordination to Scripture (as then not written) the Church was by Saint *Paul* called *the pillar and ground of Truth*. Now ſhew me your Text in which there muſt be a ſubordination, and ſuch a ſubordination as may make the Church not to be truly ſuch a pillar and ſuch a ground of Truth, as all men may not now rely on it any longer as they did before all Scripture was written. I call for your Text, not for your reaſon, againſt which other Reaſons will ſoon be found. And as for that ſaying of Saint *Irenæus*, *the Scripture is the pillar and ground of Truth*; it hath not upon his ſaying greater authority, then the terming of the Church the pillar and ground of truth hath upon the authority of St. *Paul*. My proofe, as grounded on S. *Paul*, is ſtronger then yours as grounded on St. *Irenæus*: yet I make not St. *Irenæus* contrary to St. *Paul*, what

what he ſaith of the Scripture I yeild for true, yeild me what St. *Paul* ſaith that I may ground my faith upon the Church. This I cannot do unleſs God ſpeaketh by his Church. If God ſpeaketh by his Church I pray believe what he ſpeaketh. He telleth me by his Church, that I am to admitt of the Scriptures as his undoubted word, upon this his telling me ſo, I ground that faith by which I believe the Scriptures, ſo that I believe the Scriptures for the Church, which faith of mine is as ſurely grounded as was the faith of the true believers, who at that very time, in which St. *Paul* did write theſe words, did ground their faith in all points upon the Church as you cannot deny. And thus in repect of us, the Church is firſt believed independently of Scripture, to which we are moſt prudently moved by ſuch motives as I have ſpecified, and the Scripture in order to us, cometh to be acknowledged as Gods word upon the authority of the Church, there being no other aſſured ſtay (ſpeaking of the whole and undoubted Canon) to know the true Scripture from falſe. The Scripture is not the firſt Principle, but upon ſuppoſition, that every one among chriſtians, admit of it for Gods Word, and ſo we argue out of it againſt one another. But ſpeaking of him, who is to begin to be a chriſtian (as where all once began) he cannot admit of Scripture as men admit of the firſt Principles of Sciences, which of themſelves appear ſo clearly true, that all you canbring to prove their truth will appear leſſe true then thoſe Principles appear by themſelves. The Scripture is not the firſt Principle in this ſenſe appearing evidently by its own light to be Gods Word, as I have ſhewed at large. And this anſwereth all you ſay until you come to make good your new interpretation of St. *Pauls* words, an interpretation unheard of to all antiquity, and to all men until this age. Neceſſity now forced men to their ſhifts to put off Scripture when it made againſt them. Theſe words muſt now be neceſſarily referred to that which is ſaid in the verſe

verſe following concerning the myſtery of the Incarnation, and ſo (though St. *Paul*) did write this Epiſtle in Greek, he muſt needs be ſaid to have uſed here *an Ebraiſme*. And why muſt he needs be ſaid to have done ſo here in this particular place becauſe ſomtimes ſuch *Ebraiſms* be uſed in the new Teſtament. Whether this reaſon wil juſtifie ſo new an interpretation of words (even for a thouſand and five hundered yeares applied to the Church, never applied to the Miſtery of the Incarnation) ſhall be determined even by the Principles of one of your greateſt Divines now living I mean *Dr. Feremy Taylor* in his *Diſcourſe of the Liberty of prophecying* Sect. 4. *An other great pretence* (for juſtifying new interpretations) *is the conference of places* (*which you would uſe here by conferring* this place to ſome few places in which ſuch *Ebraiſmes* be uſed in Greek) *A thing of ſuch indefinite capacity that if there be ambiguity of words, variety of ſence, alteration of circumſtances or difference of ſtile amongſt Divine writers, there is nothing which may be more abuſed by wilful people, or may more eaſily deceive the unwary or that may amuſe the moſt intelligent obſervours.* This he proveth by ſeveral examples, and then he truly ſaith, *This is a fallacy a Poſſe ad eſſe.* It is poſſible a thing ſometimes may be ſo, therefore undoubtedly here it is ſo. There be ſuch *Ebraiſmes* ſome where, therefore they muſt needs be here, where for a thouſand and five hundred yeares no man obſerved any ſuch thing, Moſt truly ſaith the ſame Doctor, *This is the great way of anſwering* all the Arguments which can be brought againſt any thing that any *man hath a mind to defend.* Sir you who make the Scripture judge of all Controverſies ſhould not (of all men) juſtifie ſuch liberty of new interpretation as this your proceeding would bring in. Or if you doe you will ſoon ſee (and may already ſee it) that your judge will be made to ſpeak what each party pleaſeth. And thus will be unable to decide any thing. But to proceed, The Church, truly being (before the Canon was written) *the pillar and ground of truth,*

*truth* in it ſelf without any ſubordination, ſo that the believers looked no further then that God taught them ſuch and ſuch things by the Church, I have from the text all I deſire to prove; that Gods aſſiſtance promiſed to the Church ſhould reach as farre as infallibility. Whether this infallibility be equal to that of the Apoſtles or no maketh not to the purpoſe, ſo long as it is granted that our faith relying upon her authority doth rely as ſecurely as that which relies upon the Pillar and ground of truth. Here you come in with a parentheſis noting me for a *French* Catholique, for allowing infallibility to the Pope defining with a council. Sir, you are no Schollar if you know not that all Roman Catholiques allow infallibility to the Pope defining with a council.

24 But becauſe I ſay alſo that God ſpeaketh by his Church propoſing infallibly his truth by her mouth, you tell me that I hence may plainly ſee how the Roman tyranny drawes me neceſſarily into peril of blaſphemy. A deepe charge, needing a ſtrong proof. And yet all your proof *is becauſe now there is no need of Scripture ſince God ſpeakes as infallibly by his Church as by his word* Sir, I pray why is it more blaſphemy to ſay that God ſpeaketh by Chriſts Church, who ſpoke infallibly by the Church of the law of Nature for two thouſand yeares (ſee here Numb. 32.) And when he then began to ſpeak by *Moſes* and the Scripture to the Jewes, he ſtill by his Church ſpoke to the faithful among the Gentiles) and the Jewes might have grounded their faith on that voice) for two thouſand yeares more. And when the writers of the former parts of the new Teſtament did write what they writ, and when St. *Paul* did write what he writ, God did infallibly teach all by the Church; and yet theſe writers thought Scriptures neceſſary, but not neceſſary for all the ends for which you may think them neceſſary. Again, what a ſlender proofe is this to ground a charge of blaſphemy upon ſo vaſt a multitude, as adhere to the Roman Church? There is no need of Scripture if God ſpeaketh by his Church to

infallibility. Did not God ſpeak to infallibility by the Scripturers teaching that Jeſus was the Meſſias? Was it therefore meer blaſphemy to account St. *John Baptiſt* ſent by God to teach the ſame with infallible aſſurance? Was it therefore meer blaſphemy to think that voice was infallible by which God the Father teſtified the ſame from Heaven? Was it therefore meer blaſphemy, to account the teſtimony of miracles (ordained to teſtifie the ſame thing) infallible, though Chriſt calleth it *teſtimonium majus Joannæ. Joan.* 5? Or rather is it not meer blaſphemy to ſay all theſe teſtimonies beſides Scripture are needleſs? Do you not ſee that after all the teſtimonies of God by the Scripture, and by the Church, that ſtill millions do not believe? Why is then one of theſe teſtimonies ſuperfluous? The Church is not more Enthuſiaſtical now then ſhe was for 4. thouſand years before ſhe had all the promiſes which Chriſt made her of aſſiſtance, which ſhould be at leaſt as ſpeciall and full, as ſhe ever had before. Before ſhe delivered only what ſhe had received by Tradition. Now ſhe delivereth what ſhe received by Tradition and by Scripture, in interpreting of which (according to that ſenſe truly intended by the Holy Ghoſt) the ſame Holy Ghoſt doth aſſiſt her; ſo that here is no new Revelation claimed to be made to her, but an infallible aſſiſtance to propoſe faithfully what was formerly revealed. If others claim ful aſſurance by the Spirit in any point, let them ſhew as good promiſes made to them in particular, as are made to the Church, and we ſhall never account theſe falſe Enthuſiaſts. This infallible aſſiſtance being promiſed to the Church by God cānot be voted frō her by the multitude of miſ-believers who oppoſe her, tho yon ſet thē all loos to vote againſt her.

25 After all, you will have St. *Paul* call the Church the Pillar and ground of truth with an intention only to ſet forth the office, and not with an intention to ſet forth the authority of the Church. Sir, how can you know St. *Paul* intention but by his words? And ſure I am that no word could

could in briefe more fully set forth her infallible authority, then by declaring her to be the pillar it selfe, and the ground of truth. When he useth such words as declare this as sufficiently as need to be, how know you that he intended not to declare this sufficiently? I ask also in any mans apprehention, what office of the Church is signified by calling her *the ground of truth?* In which words an assuredly grounded authority will presently appear to be signified. O but you know his intention was to signifie the office only of the Church, and not her Authority, *because he meant here to instruct Timothy how to carry himselfe in the Church of God, and to this purpose it had been impertinent to speak of her Authority*, as you think. I think it was very pertinent to speak of it even to this purpose. For is it not fit that in a Church, which is to be held for the publick Oracle of the world, the cheif Pastors of this Church (especially those who were to be first of all made cheife Pastors) should behave themselves so, as not to make men believe it improbable that God should assist infallibly such a Church? How much do, not your multitude only, but your greatest Doctors think themselves to say against the infallibility promised to such a Church as ours is, in which they see sometimes scandalous Popes, scandalous Cardinals, scandalous Bishops, &c. Which though it be a pittyful argument, because scandalous men, and *Solomon* the Idolater have been assisted with an infallibility to be Writers of Scripture it selfe, yet it is an argument which troubleth weak soules. And therefore to take away such scandals, it is very convenient that Bishops, especially those who were first of all preferred to that office, should be *blameless, continent, vigilant, sober, of good behaviour*; and *that they should have a good report even from the enemies of the Church.* Also, that the *Deacons should be grave, not double tongued, not given to much Wine or covetous.* These and such like precepts as these were much to the purpose, and as so were here given by St. *Paul*, to maintain the credit

of such a Church as might seem to all fit to be accounted the Oracle of the World. *The Pillar and ground of Truth.*

39 Let us heare how you argue here. *If the infallibility of the Church were here affirmed, then Timothy needed not such instructions to take care how he behaved himself in the Church, since infallible assistance is immediate, and that which is immediate includes no time for the inspiration, nor means of instruction,* so you. A strange Consequence. The Church is infallible in defining points in a general Councel, *Ergo,* no man needeth instructions for his private good behaviour. Was it so for the first two thousand yeares before the Scripture was written? Or do we perhaps teach this infallible assistance to be communicated to every one immediatly? And how is it true that the assistance which is immediate to the Church assembled in a full Council, *includes no time for the inspiration, nor no means for the instruction?* Do you think that as soon as all are assembled they are presently all, or the greater part, to define all things as fast as they are proposed; was it so when the Apostles and the Elders of the Church were assembled together in the first Councel? though this issued forth their decree with this preface. *It seemed Good to the Holy Ghost and us.* Was there no time required for this short Decree. No means used before it was made? Read those words. *The Apostles and the Elders coming together to consider of the matter. And when there had been much disputing, Peter rose up and said.* There followeth his speech. Then St. *James* made an other speech, To what purpose all these speeches, and these made after former *much disputing,* if your doctrine be true, that *neither time nor use of any be to proceed the immediate assistance of the holy Ghost* which they had undoubtedly. And here as if you had proved some thing you have a fling at the Council of Trent for sitting so long; a thing as little derogatory to that Councils infallibility, as that *much disputing,* and making several

speeches

speeches was derogatory to the infallibility of the council of the Apostles, in which onely one short Decree was made. Look on the many Canons, and Decrees for Reformation in matters subject to great Disputes, Oppositions of secular power (which crossed not the Apostles first Council) Look on the multitude of Heresies condemned, after a full hearing of all that could be said by all parties, and it must needs be rather a point of satisfaction to all, then a scandal unto any, to see so mature consideration used. But both a slow and a hastie, and a mean delivery of any ones condemnation, will be distasteful to the condemned person.

27. As for the Authoritie of St. *Athanasius* calling the definition of the council of *Nice*, by which the Consubstantiality of God the Son with his Father, *The Word of God*, it sheweth clearly, that this prime Doctor held that God delivered his Word unto us by the council. Your Answer is that the councils Definition did not bind with Relation to the Authority of the Council, but by the authothority of Scripture Ministerially proposed by the council. Sir, I have already shewed, Chap. 2. Numb. 4. that the cleerest Text which the council had to cite, even that text, *I and my Father are one*, can be so expounded by an *Arrian*, that it doth no more then probably declare the consubstantiality. But (as you say here) *If the text be but probable we cannot frō thence urge this probable sense of it as an object of faith.* But S. *Athanasius* urgeth Cōsubstantialitie (after the *Nicene* council) *as Gods Word*, and an Object of Faith, which he cannot doe with a Relation to a Text onely probable in Scripture, Therefore he doth it with Relation to the infallibility of the councils Authority, which council if it had onely Authority to propose, like a Minister, such and such Texts, as may be severally taken (and consequently mistaken) by an Interpreter, who is onely fallible, could not be said in its Interpretations to propose the undoubted Word of God.

And

And though Saint *Athanasius* held that as truth before the council in order to himself who was convinced, that his interpretation was conformable to the ancient Doctrine of the Church, yet in order to those, who were not before the council convinced by that Verity, he could not boldly denounce this as an infallible meaning of Gods Word obliging all. Or This Declaration of Gods Word by the council, he boldly said, *The Word of God, by the Council of Nice ordained for ever.* After this, you come in again with the councell of *Ariminum*, contending that council as well to be believed for it self as the council of *Nice*. And you think if more exceptions could have been made against the authority of the council of *Ariminum*, Saint *Austin*, against his *Arrian* adverlary might easily have Prevailed, by insisting onely upon the authority of the council of *Nice*, which he waveth, and goeth to arguments out of Scripture. Sir, A man of reading cannot but know that the council of *Ariminum* is never by the Fathers (no nor by your Church of *England*) numbred among the first foure councils, which foure by addition of this council (had it been a lawful council) should have been made Five. And you might as well think, that I might prevail against you by only citing the council of *Trent*, which I never cited yet, but stood wholly on other arguments. For I know as we in vain dispute with Heathens out of Scripture, or out of Saint *Matthewes* Gospel against *Mahomet*, or out of the *Machabees* against you, so Saint *Austin* in vain had insisted upon the *Nicene* Council against one who scoffed at it, as you do at that of *Trent*. He being well furnished with other arguments out of Scripture admitted by him, intended by them onely at that time to overthrow him, and not to meddle with a long contention (fit to fill a book alone) about the validity of the council of *Nice*, and invalidity of that of *Ariminum*, as we two for the like reason doe not stand onely contesting about the authority of the

coun-

council of *Trent*, I am now for a long time to contest with you about the Scripture onely, as Saint *Austin* did with him.

28. But before I enter further upon this contestation about this controversie of the Infallibility of the Church, I must put you in mind of your own doctrine, which teacheth that all necessary controversies are clearly decided according to the truth by plain Scripture. This controversie then being one of the most necessary must clearly according to your doctrine be decided for you against me by plain Scripture. If then I can but shew that it is not this clearly decided against me, I clearly shew that I hold no errour in this point. For all errour in such a necessary point as this is, can be demonstrated to be against plain Scripture. What I hold (to wit, that the Church is Infallible) cannot be demonstrated by plain Scripture to be so. Therefore what I hold is no error. Now I must prove that what I hold of the infallibility of the Church cannot by clear Scripture be demonstrated to be an error. This I prove thus. The Scripture is not so clear against this as it is for this. Therefore this cannot by clear Scripture be demonstrated to be an error. My first proposition must be shewed by citing as clear texts for what I hold of this point, as you can bring against it. Well then, for this point I have alledged in the beginning of this chapter, the text, promising, *That the gates of Hell shall not prevail against this Church*; and that text whichtels us we must hear the Church under pain of being by Gods judgment accounted as Publicans and Heathens, and that the Church is the Pillar and ground of truth.

29. In my 25. Numb. of my former Treatise I adde a fourth Text, *Behold I am with you all dayes, even to the consummation of the world.* Out of this & such like promises made to the Apostles we prove their infallibility in teaching, in writing, &c. But these words are to be verified unto the consummation of the world, therefore they must not only

Of my 23th. Number.

only contain a promiſe made of being with the Apoſtles, who died a thouſand and 6 hundred yeares ago, but of being with the Prelats of the Church their ſucceſſors, who ſhall be to the conſummation of the world. Your anſwer to this Text ſhall be rendred in your own words that you may not complain of foul play. Your words were, *Although the promiſe be extendible to the end of the world, yet it is not neceſſary to underſtand it ſo, as that there ſhall alwayes be equality of aſſiſtance to the times of the Apoſtles, which is hard to affirme ſince we cannot ſee that there is any ſuch neceſſity for ſuch aſſiſtance.* And by thoſe words *ſuch aſſiſtance*. Your laſt reply ſheweth that you meane *aſſiſtance extended to infallibility*. Sir, ſtand to Scripture and ſhew out of the Text that he promiſeth to be with them, ſecuring them from all error in the firſt age, and he promiſeth not ſo much for the ſecond or third age. Againſt your reaſons we have our reaſons, bring againſt my illimited text another text, teaching clearly that my Text ought to be limited to a ſmaller aſſiſtance in other ages then was here promiſed for the firſt. As for the neceſſity of the people (which was the prime reaſon why Chriſt gave this infallibility) it was greater in ages remoter from Chriſt, you *ask why then be our traditions now equally infallible to thoſe of theſe times.* I anſwer that as it is harder to prove now that Chriſt did ſuch miracles, was crucified, did riſe again, then it was preſently after theſe things happened, yet all theſe things be as infallibily true now, as they were then, and as infallible; ſo I ſay of Traditions, which for all this doe not loſe a ſufficient meaſure of infallible certainty. But to go on. What if there be no ſuch neceſſity of ſuch aſſiſtance for other ages; what Text have you to prove that God muſt needs give no more then is neceſſary, and cannot promiſe more, and give what he promiſeth? I know you will ſay this infallibility in ages after the Scripture was not neceſſary, becauſe the Scriptures alone would ſerve to decide all controverſies. Sir, did not the Church

alone

alone ſerve to decide all Controverſies before the Scripture was written. Yes, Why then was Scripture thought neceſſary by you even for this end, for which the Church was well provided before? Again, the old Scripture, did it not teſtifie, as much as was neceſſary, *that Jeſus Chriſt was the true Meſsias?* Yes. To what end then was Saint *John Baptiſt* ſent to teſtifie this? To what end a voyce ſent from Heaven to teſtifie this? To what end ſo many Miracles wrought to teſtifie this? To what end did Chriſt and his Apoſtles ſtill further teſtifie this? Mark here how falſe your judgement is in thinking God will promiſe juſt what is neceſſary, and no more. Sir, in Ages after the firſt when the Church ſhould grow from a Grain of Muſtard-ſeed, to be a Tree of vaſt extent, in ſuch a vaſt compaſſe, and in progreſſe of many Ages a world of doubts would riſe, *which Bookes were Scripture, which not? Which corrupted Scripture, which not? Which was the undoubted ſenſe of the uncorrupted Scripture, which not?* Why might not Chriſt (for any thing you know by Scripture) think this a ſufficient Reaſon to promiſe an aſſiſtance extended to infallibility for other Ages of the Church as well as for the firſt age. Will an authority ſo aſſiſted to teſtifie all this infallibly be leſſe neceſſary then ſo many Authorities to Teſtifie that Jeſus Chriſt was the true Meſſias, after it was infallibly Teſtified by true Scripture? And all theſe Teſtimonies were given to the Jewes, as ill as they were diſpoſed. How then can you ſay of the Church of Chriſt, that ſhe, for want of this Diſpoſition, was deprived of this Aſſiſtance in all Ages but the firſt? What you adde of Traditions, hath been already Anſwered: See alſo Number Twelve. But what you adde of Scripture having ſtill the ſame certaintie is apparently falſe, ſpeaking (as you ſpeake) in Order to aſſure us. For you your ſelfe confeſſe, that divers Bookes of Scripture (as the *Apoca-*

*Apocalyps* &c.) are now held certain, which were not held ſo before. Again, many, and a good many, bookes of Scripture are quite loſt. How know you by Scripture only, that no neceſſary point for practice or beliefe (contained in thoſe bookes only) did not periſh with the bookes themſelves. And as for the bookes we have, you ſee how uncertain we remain about the true ſenſe of them in higheſt points. Then they had the Apoſtles themſelves, or the known Diſciples of the Apoſtles, to tell them the meaning of theſe words, *This is my Body*, is this ſo really, or figuratively only; Theſe words, *Baptize all Nations*, do or do not, include Infants. To be a *Prieſt*, or a *Biſhop*, was to have power to ſacrifice, to abſolve, or was it not? Now times make theſe held for uncertainties; whereas by and by you admit that by this promiſe of Chriſt, the Church is ſecure from damnable error, thongh not from all ſimple errors, for then no body ſhould be left for God to be withal; you admit that which will deſtroy quite what you ſaid before. For before you ſaid, *Hereſie conſiſted in oppoſition to clear Scripture*: whence all thoſe muſt needs be Hereticks who oppoſed clear Scripture. Therefore all thoſe who held theſe prime points in which you and we differ, with us againſt you, were Hereticks; for they held theſe points, which (as you ſay) are againſt clear Scripture; But by your own confeſſion Chriſt had no viſible Church baptizing, teaching all Nations, &c. but thoſe who held theſe prime points in which we and you differ; wherefore we muſt confeſſe that Chriſt was with theſe Oppoſers of evident Scripture, or elſe you cannot ſhew with what Members of the Church he was for all theſe laſt ages preceding the Reformation. Let us go on.

30. What kind of aſſiſtance Chriſt promiſed, may be gathered (behold a fifth Text) out of ſeveral words in the 14. chapter of Saint *John*, there (verſe 15.) he ſaith, *I will pray the Father, and he ſhall give another Comforter, that*

*that he may abide with you for ever, even the Spirit of Truth, whom the world cannot receive.* And verſe 27. *The Comforter, which is the Holy Ghoſt whom the Father will ſend in my Name, he ſhall teach you all things and ſuggeſt unto you all things whatſoever I ſhall ſay unto you.* And chap. 16. ver. 12. *I have yet many things to ſay unto you; How be it when the ſpirit of Truth is come he will guide you into all Truth.* I aske now according to theſe Texts, How long is this ſpirit of Truth to abide with them in their ſucceſſours? *For ever*; ſaith the Text. Shall he alſo ſecure thoſe, with whom he for ever abideth, from all errour? *He will guide you into all Truth*, ſaith the Text. Give me then leave, leſſe to regard what you ſay to the contrary. Where there is *all Truth*, there is no errour. If you anſwer there is no Fundamental errour. I Reply, that *all Truth* excludes all errour, either in points Fundamental, or not Fundamental. And being you cannot aſſuredly tell me which points be Fundamental, which not; which deſtructive of ſalvation, which not; which be curable, which are not; you muſt grant me that ſhe is to be believed in all points. And fear not to believe her, *She will guide you into all Truth.* Therfore you may ſecurely follow her in all herwaies. This promiſe of Chriſt made equally to the Apoſtles, and to their ſucceſſours, the viſible Teachers and Guides of the Church which were to guide people into all Truth *for ever*, muſt needs have been verified all this laſt thouſand years before your Reformation. All this time, all the viſible Guides or Prelates of the Church were led, and did lead into opinions contrary to the Tenets of your Church. But all this time *the ſpirit of Truth did abide with them, guiding them into all Truth.* Therefore the opinions contrary to your Tenets were true, and not errors. If he ſhould be with your Prelats beginning this laſt age to hold contrary to the Prelats of the laſt thouſand years) he ſhould be with thoſe who teach contradictions in points of belief, oppoſite to the former belief. Behold a clear reaſon why I appro-

priate this promiſe to our Biſhops and Church, and not to yours, the Holy Ghoſt could not teach thoſe guides of the Church *for ever*, who for a vaſt long time of many ages were not in the World. Shew me a ſucceſſion in all Ages of the guides or lawful Paſtors of any Church houlding your Texts in points differing from ours, and then I muſt labour to find a reaſon why I ſay the Holy Ghoſt, ever ſince Chriſts time, guided the lawful Paſtors of our Church into all truth, rather then the lawful Paſtors of your Church, which Paſtors had no being in the Church or world and conſequently no capacity to be guided into all truth.

31 *A Sixth Text* to prove this aſſiſtance to be extended to infallibility is 4 *Epheſ.* whence appeareth that the end and intention of Chriſt *in giving* us (who were viſible in all ages) *Doctors and Paſtors* for all ages was ſuch an end, and ſuch an intention, as could not be compaſſed by ſuch Doctors and Paſtors as might *lead us into circumvention of errour*, even then when they where aſſembled together to deliver the truth from their higheſt tribunal in a General Council. How pittifully would *the Saints be conſummated* by ſuch Doctors? How pittifully would *the work of the Miniſtry* be performed, how pittifully would *the Body of Chriſt be edified by ſuch* Doctors and Paſtors. Laſtly how impoſſible would it be for us by the having of ſuch doctors, and Paſtors *that wee now* (provided of ſuch guides) *be not children wavering and carried about with the wind of doctrine in the wickedneſs of men, in craftineſs, in circumvention of error.* You ſee St. *Paul* affirms the Doctors and Paſtors which are given unto us, to be given for this end (and conſequently ſufficiently aſſiſted to the ſame) that we may ſecurely reſt in their doctrine, which we may not do in any erroneous doctrine, be the errour little or great. For it were a ridiculous thing to ſay, *we were to reſt circumvented in error, leaſt we ſhould fall into circumvention of error.* The aſſiſtance therefore is ſuch as preſerves from all error, and ſuch an aſſiſtance was proportionable to Gods intention of Se-

Securing us from having reaſon to *waver* or to be changing, and changing, ſo to cure ſome curable errors, with which we feared to be circumvented, whereas by the unanimous doctrine of theſe Doctors and Paſtors, God intended to preſerve us ſufficiently from ever falling *into circumvention of errour.*

32. *A ſeventh Text* to prove the aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt given to the Church, to be extended to infallibility is taken from *Eſay* chap. 56. verſe 20. *and* 21. where God ſpeaketh of the Church of Chriſt, to which after his coming many of the Jewes were to unite themſelves (according to the interpretation of Saint *Paul* 18. *Romans verſe* 26. *Thus God by Eſay, The redeemer ſhall come to Sion and unto them who by uniting themſelves to Chriſts Church*) *ſhall turne from tranſgreſsion in Jacob, ſaith the Lord.* Note here that the words which our Lord is going to ſay are ſpoken to the viſible Church, to wit, that Church to which the Jewes did unite themſelves being baptized in it, inſtructed in it, governed by it, &c. Now our Lord to this Church viſibly *Baptizing, inſtructing, governing,* &c. ſaith, *As for me, this is my Covenant with them ſaith the Lord, My ſpirit that is upon thee, and my words,* (free from errour in all points great and little) *which I have put in thy mouth,* (that mouth by which thou viſibly doſt teach all Nations) *ſhall not depart out of* (this) *thy mouth. Nor out of the mouth of thy ſeed, Nor out of the mouth of thy ſeeds ſeed, ſaith the Lord, from henceforth and for ever.* Behold, here the Spirit of Truth entailed upon the Church for all Ages, *never departing from her mouth,* Nor *the mouth of her ſeeds ſeed*, which not departing from *the mouth* (by which viſibly ſhe teacheth, inſtructeth, and governeth,) ſheweth this Spirit entayled upon the Church as Viſible and not as Inviſible as you would have it. And this *not departing of his Spirit from her Mouth*, is a no leſſe clear

cleare, then eloquent expreſſion of her infallibility in her doctrine, for Gods Spirit or Word is not in a Mouth teaching error. Again, a promiſe *of not departing from her mouth from thenceforth and for ever*, maketh it evident that this laſt thouſand yeares there was ſome viſible Church, whoſe Prelates and Paſtors did ſhew their Heads, and open their Mouthes, in teaching truth. And yet what was viſibly taught all this while, was (in all points debated between you and us) oppoſit to you. By the way note how unjuſtly you not long ſince taxed thoſe of coming neer blaſphemy, who ſaid that God did ſpeak to us and teach us by his Church. What mean theſe words, *My Words ſhall not depart out of thy Mouth, Nor out of the Mouth of thy ſeed, nor of thy ſeeds ſeed?*

33 Hence (for an *Eight Text*) I may well alledge what this Prophet infers from hence in the Next Chapter, where he triumpheth in the Church thus teaching all Nations, and there he addeth, *For the nation and Kingdom that ſhall not ſerve thee ſhall periſh*, verſe 12. Becauſe if this Church ſhould ever at any time fall to teach error, Nations ſhould do well, and ſhould further their ſalvation by forſaking her erring, as the Proteſtants ſay, they did. And note how theſe words clearly ſhew that the Scripture ſpeaketh of the Church viſible, which Nations and Kingdomes may find out, and ſerve *and muſt periſh*, like publicans and Heathens, *if they doe not ſerve*, and obey: ſhe is therefore ſecured from error. Hence verſe 20. *Thy ſun ſhall no more goe down, Neither ſhall the Moon withdraw it ſelfe, For the Lord ſhall be thine everlaſting light and the daies of thy Mourning ſhall be ended.* And in the next chapter to the Sons of this Church he promiſeth, *That everlaſting Joy ſhall be unto them* verſe 7. And in the next chapter laſt verſe. *Thou ſhalt be called, ſought out a City not forſaken.* Had this Church been *forſaken* and left in ſuch errors as are imputed to the Roman Church, Chriſt had not been an *Everlaſting light to here* whom he had left in ſuch dark-

darknes for a thouſand yeares, and the *dayes of her mourning had been* theſe full thouſand yeares, ſhort of the end *of her mourning*. And there had been no reaſon why in ſuch groſſe errours ſhe ſhould (to Gods comfort) *be ſought for* and a *City not forſaken*. Theſe words I am ſure are ſpoke of a viſible Church, *ſought for, and found out*, becauſe inhabited and not *forſaken*, your inviſiible Church was ſo deſolate, that no body can tell where it was. And in this ſenſe it is a City ſtill ſought *for*, but never to be found for a thouſand yeares. Or elſe tell me where?

34 For a *ninth Text* (letting all theſe laſt Texts of *Eſay* paſſe as for one) I alledged that of *Daniel* 2.44. *In the daies of thoſe Kingdoms the God of Heaven ſhall raiſe up a Kingdome, which ſhall not be diſperſed, and his Kingdome ſhall not be delivered to another people*. And that we might know that he ſpeaketh here of the kingdome of Chriſt, which ſhould be viſible to us all, there is added a circumſtance which muſt needs make it moſt viſible, to wit. *And it ſhall break in peices and conſume all theſe* (Idolatrous) *Kingdomes and it ſhall ſtand for ever*. Now if this true Church of Chriſt, which ſo viſibly hath broken in pieces and quite aboliſhed all Idolatrous Kingdomes, be ſo viſibly *to ſtand for ever*, then this viſible Church cannot be ſaid, for this laſt 2000. year *to have been faln*; As it muſt needs be ſaid of all viſible Churches, which have bin theſe laſt thouſand years for beſides the *Roman* Church you will not find one viſible Church which hath not faln this time into confeſſed hereſie; therefore to verifie theſe words, you muſt ſay that the *Roman* Church *did not fall*, that ſo you may find Chriſt a viſible Church which *did ſtand for ever*. And thus alſo we ſhall literally expound what the Angel Gabriel ſaid of Chriſt, *And he ſhall reign in the houſe of Iacob for ever* Luke 1.33. This *Roman* Church then is the Church which hath *ſtood ever* ſince Chriſts time. Whence it is manifeſt that it did not fal either into idolatry (as you intimate hereafter when you reply to this place of *Daniel*, nor when

when it proclaim'd it ſelf to have an infallible tribunal, by which all Controverſies are to be truly decided, for erecting which tribunal you Page 22. ſay *ſhee is in peril of treaſon againſt God the judge, in ſetting up another judge in the conſciences of men.* And againe Pa. 106. *That for pretending to infallibility ſhe is highly preſumptious and in this more then an uſurper committing an inſolent uſurpation of the prerogative which belongeth only to God and Scripture.* And P. 23. you hold this *Infallibility as deſtructive to ſoules as uncertainty of true Religion, Nay (ſay you) uncertainty may be helped but infallibility hath no remedy.* Surely if the Church ſhould have univerſally faln into uncertainty of true belief, it ſhould no longer have been the *ſtanding Kingdom of Chriſt* which ſhall *ſtand for ever.* But it had been a multitude faln into the want of that faith, the want of which had put it in a ſtate in which it had been impoſſible to pleaſe God. For uncertainty in faith is wholy inconſiſtent with an infallible aſſent, but all divine faith conſiſteth in an infallible Aſſent. Therefore where there is uncertainty, there is no divine faith at all *without which it is impoſſible to pleaſe God*, as St. *Paul* ſaith you put the *Roman* Church faln (even by this one fall) into a worſe condition. Can a Church in this condition be that Church *raiſed in Chriſt* and ſpread over the world deſtroying all Idolatrous Kingdoms by her viſible preachers and teachers, ſucceeding with a viſible ſucceſſion one to another, adminiſtring viſible ſacraments, and by her viſible decrees and ſuch like viſible Acts, deſtroying all Idolatrous Kingdoms and raigning in their place viſibly, and thus in the light of the world verifying *Daniels* prophecy by ſtanding for ever in quality *of a kingdome.* Yet if the *Roman* Church be not this Church, find me out (if you can) a viſible Church, (for ſo many viſible Acts convince that the Church verifying theſe words muſt be viſible) diſtinct from the *Roman*, and agreeing with yours in the points debated between us, what you hereafter adde concerning this place of *Daniel*, and my

firſt

firſt place out of *Eſay*, I ſhall anſwer in its place. Here I thought good to put all theſe nine Texts of Scripture together that their force might the better appear.

35. This being done I muſt again put you in mind that according to your doctrine, *Scripture alone is able by clear Texts to decide all Controverſies according to truth*, This Controverſie of the fallibility, or infallibility of the Church erected by Chriſt, is one of the moſt important Controverſies that can be raiſed in the Church. Now you (who pretend this Controverſy to be decided for you againſt me by clear Texts of Scripture) are obliged by clearer Texts, then all theſe are put together, to prove that Chriſts viſible Church is fallible, I ſay Chriſts viſible Church, for all my Texts ſpeak of that, and not of the Synagogue, and therefore the Texts you bring muſt be concerning Chriſts Church. And you muſt bring Texts and not diſcourſes, or elſe you decide not the Controverſy by the ſentence of the judge to which only you appeal. Obſerve theſe few things and give me theſe Texts, and I here give you free leave to proclaim me quite vanquiſhed, and driven out of the field. And by this you will ſee that we adhere not therefore to the defence of the Churches Tribunal, becauſe we fear to be tried by Scripture, but becauſe upon trial made by Scripture, her Tribunal is proved infallible and in all things to be obeyed by us.

36. What occurreth next is, to juſtifie my ſelfe from the falſe ſlander with which you charge me *of corrupting the Text in St. Auſtin Lib. de Utilitate credendi Cap.* 19. Sir if I ſhould doe as you did, that is, if I ſhould only regard that Edition of St. *Auſtin* which I have, I ſhould not only juſtifie my ſelfe but condemne you of corrupting this place. Now I onely charge the Edition which you uſed, of corruption, yea of ſuch corruption that a man could not but ſuſpect it who would read the context with his perfect ſences about him. For St. *Auſtin*

*in his* 14. *Chapter*, having ſaid that he firſt believed, moved by the authority of the Catholick Church, which there he ſheweth to have been done by him upon good reaſon; he cometh in the 51 *Chapter* to preſſe his adverſaries to the eaſieſt way of freeing themſelves from errour by yeilding to the authority of the ſame Church. And then in his *Sixteenth Chapter he urgeth* the wholeſomneſſe of following this authority. Here come in thoſe words which I cited, to wit, *for if the divine providence of God doth not preſide in humane affairs, in vain would Sollicitude be about Religion. But if both the very beauty of all things and our inward conſcience doth both publickely and privately exhort us to ſeek out and ſerve God, we are not to diſpair that there is ſome authority appointed by the ſame God, on which authority we relying as on an aſſured ſtep may be lifted up to God.* My adverſary wil needs read theſe laſt words thus. *On which authority we relying as on an aſſured ſtep, may be lifted up to God. Velut gradu incerto innitentes attolluram ad Deum.* As if an unaſſured or an uncertain ſtep could help to lift us up to God, and were a thing to be relied upon to this end, and given us as a help by God to this end, that we may rely upon it, and we being ſo well provided of uncertainty in the authority appointed by God for us, ought not to deſpair of coming by this authority to the certain truth. Is not this perfect and compleat non-ſenſe. And can you think in earneſt that here you have reaſon to tell me that the ſcope of St. *Auſtins* diſcourſe may diſcover my corrupting his Text? Doth it not evidently diſcover the corruption of your *Frobeniã* Edition, *An.* 1569. wch would needs read, *Gradu incerto innitentes attollamur ad Deum*, whereas other Editions read *gradu certo innitemes* even the Edition of *Eraſmus*, whoſe judgement yours uſe to eſteem moſt accurate. Yea, be in the beginning of his Edition profeſſeth to put down ſuch a Note as this is [ ] when he varieth from the *Frobenian* Edition, and yet here he putteth no ſuch note in his *Paris* Edition, *Anno* 1555. which Edition of *Eraſmus*, is ancienter then yours. So that your *Frobenian* Edition corruptedly

ruptedly differeth in this place from that ancienter *Frobenian* Edition, of which *Erasmus* made mention a dozen years before yours was printed. Neither can you make any thing like ſenſe of S. *Auſtins* words by reading them as you cited them; *that by the authority appointed by God we ſhould as by an uncertain ſtep be lifted up to God.* So that here you may eaſily perceive how little reaſon you had to carp at infallibility. And again, you had as litle reaſon to put me in mind that one part of that authority of which St. *Auſtin* here ſpeaketh is drawn from the miracles which Chriſt did. Sir, do theſe miracles make this authority *to be relied upon, as upon an unaſſured ſtep, or as upon an aſſured ſtep to lift us up to God.* Now Sir, how ſhal you ever be able to ſecure me that you can know, and infallibly know, corrupted Scripture from uncorrupted, when I ſee this your talent in knowing corruptions ſo deficient, as I have here ſhewed it to be, even when you are ſo confident of it that you charge your adverſary of corruption, which had you not done, he had now made no uſe of this place ſo clear to his purpoſe. But he muſt needs now expect a better anſwer from you to this place.

37. In my 24. *I intreat you not to explicate the places which I had above alledged for the Churches infallibility, as if they were to be underſtood ſo as onely to be true when the Church judgeth conformably to Scripture; for even in that ſence the devil himſelfe (father of Lyes) is infallible, ſo long as he teacheth conformable to Scripture, and the gates of hell cannot by errour prevail againſt the devil of Hell. Yea, as long as he doth this, he will be the pillar and ground of Truth,* that is ſubordinately as you ſpeak of the Church, to wit, *ſo far as either of them rely on the written word.* You anſwer firſt, *that we are not commanded but forbidden to conſult with the Devil, but we are enjoyned to conſult with the Church of God.* I anſwer, that this hinders not his being infallible as long as he ſpeaketh conformably to Scripture. And I am glad to ſee you acknowledge a command to conſult with the Church, for ſure I am that this muſt be underſtood of conſulting with a viſible Church and viſible in all Ages.

Of my 24. h. Number.

Ages. For people were in all ages to obey this command of conſulting with her. But it is impoſſible in any age to conſult with an inviſible Church. Therefore there was in all ages a true viſible Church. *Secondly, you ſay we have always cauſe to ſuſpect the Divel.* I anſwer this hinders not his being truly infallible ſo long as he teacheth conformably to Scripture. In your third anſwer you ſeem to make the divel and the Church agree, for you neither believe the divel in point of truth upon his authority, nor the Church to ſpeak truth upon her authority, wherefore for all you have ſaid as yet, the divel may as well be *the pillar and ground of truth* as the Church, though I confeſſe freely, *it is not his office to be ſo.*

Again though you be not moved to think that the divel ſaith to be true, yet this hinders not his ſpeaking as true as the Church doth, as long as he ſpeaketh conformable to Scripture. And though I grant that you may in ſome reſpect make more account of what the Church ſaith for her authority, then of what the devil ſaith upon his authority, yet ſtanding ſtill in our caſe, which ſuppoſeth the divel *de facto* to deliver what is conformable to Scripture, you (who refuſe to give an infallible aſſent to what the Church ſaith at all times but when you ſee that which ſhe ſaith to be conformable to Scripture) you I ſay, muſt never build this aſſent as infallible more upon the Church then upon the divel, to whoſe ſaying you would give an infallible aſſent when you ſee that which he ſaith to be conformable to Scripture. But whilſt you are ſo buſie in giving ſo many anſwers to what I ſaid about the divel, you ſmother up that which clearly overthroweth the reply of you and yours, who ſay we muſt follow the Church only ſo far as we ſee her follow Scripture. For I ſhewed that thoſe who could not ſee at all how far the Church followed Scripture, were bound to follow that Church for the firſt two thouſand yeares of the world, which were before all Scripture, or before what was known to be the Scripture in ſubſtance, or before it were

were known whether there ſhould be any Scripture or no. So how could thoſe many barbarous Nations, who never having ſeen the Scripture did truly believe, (as S. *Ireneus* teſtifies) what was taught them by the Church, though they could not poſſibly ſee how far that which was taught them, and that which they believed, did agree with the Scripture which they had never ſeen.

38. Your two next paragraphs contend to take from me two of my former texts cited for the infallibility of the Church, by expounding thoſe texts not to ſpeak of the viſible Church. But I have ſhewed the contrary concerning them both. Concerning that out of *Daniel* I did ſhew this even now Num. 34. Concerning that out of *Eſay* I ſhewed it Num. 32. And 33. As for all additional teſtimonies out of Fathers you know why I reſolve to paſſe them. And ſo together with them I muſt let paſſe even that maine and convincing place of St. *Auſtin*: this ſuppoſed, I have ended all which belongeth to this Chapter. Of my 25th. and 26th. Number.

# The fifth Chapter.

## *The Church which is our Judge, and Infallible, is the Roman Church.*

ALL that I am to prove here is, that upon Suppoſition that it is now made good that the Church is our judge in all Controverſies and alſo that it is made good that ſhe is infallible, that all this can be verified of no other Church then the Roman. Whence it followeth, that whoſoever will ſay any thing againſt that which I did undertake to prove in this part of my diſcourſe, muſt argue againſt me not by denying ſome Church to be judge of Controverſies and infallible, but admitting that for truth, he muſt prove that I Of my 27th. Numb.

with

without reason claim this right of judicature, and this infallibility for the *Roman* Church, and onely for the *Roman*, still understanding by the *Roman* Church, all Churches which submit themselves to the Bishop of *Rome* as to their supreme Pastor.

3 That then which remaineth here to be proved I did prove and still do prove thus, the Protestant Church and all other Churches different from the *Roman*, do judge themselves, acknowledge themselves, declare and professe themselves, to be fallible, and that according to infallible Scripture. If then any of these Churches be infallible (in what they judge, and declare for truth grounded in Scripture) they are infallible in this their judging and delaring themselves to be fallible. Therefore infallibly they are fallible. Therefore, upon supposition that it hath been formerly proved that some Church is judge of Controversies, and Infallible, and it being by the former argument demonstratively proved that neither the Protestant Church, nor any Church different from the *Roman* can be judge of Controversies and infallible, it evidently followes that only the *Roman* Church is this judge and is infallible as she teacheth her selfe to be. Here you exclaim *at my abusing others by ratiocinations*, which notwithstanding, I confidently say you could not, nor cannot solve. Therefore prehaps you are pleased to wonder and then gibe at my argument, as if I only argued thus. *The Roman Church claimeth infallibility, therefore by claiming of it she hath right to it.* This argument you may freely scoff at, it is nothing like mine. And yet in undoing this fond argument you only busie your selfe and say nothing, to that wch I pressed and still presse, that the Church which is apointed by God for infallible judge of Controversies, cannot possible be any of those Churches which teach themselves not to be this infallible judge. It had bin very easie to have understood this right and not to make me say, that only laying claim to infallibility is a sufficient proof of infallibility. It is a very different thing to say, *He that must be*

*be a Minister must be a Man and not a Woman*, and to say, *such an one must needs be a Minister because he is a man and not a Woman*. So it is one thing to say, *the Church which is the infallible judge must be a Church, judging and teaching her selfe to be infallible and cannot be a Church which judgeth and teacheth her selfe fallible*; And another thing to say, *that that Church is infallibly judge which teacheth her selfe to be so*. This I said not, but I said, *that Church that must be infallible must not want this condition*, and therefore no Church teaching her selfe (even according to Scripture) to be fallible, can truly be this infallible judge. Against my argument truly related, you have not one word, without you think you have answered me by saying, *that no Church of Christ is infallible*, and therefore *not the Roman*. But Sir did not you alwayes hitherto still importunely call upon me to prove that *even upon supposition*, that the Church was our judge and Infallible, that these great prerogatives belonged to the Church of *Rome*. You bid me still prove this even *standing upon the supposition*, that some Church was judge and infallible. Is it then any thing like a Scholar like answer to return no other answer to my argument but by now saying the supposition is not true, the truth of which, *though allowed*, you contended to be nothing to my purpose. If you will grant me that, if any Church be judge of Controversies and infallible, this is our Church, I have done. Neither intend I any thing else in this chapter.

3 You bring an argument to prove our Church fallible because either it erred in admitting, or in rejecting the *Millenary opinion* before admitted. Sir I call upon you to prove that ever our infallible Judge (that is the supreme Pastor of the Church defining with the Church assembled in a Council) did admit of the *Millinary opinion*. If this be not done you prove not our Iudge to be fallible and this I am sure can never be proved. Yea it cannot be proved that the Church diffused or Universal, did at any one age unanimously admit of this doctrine for a point of faith. For when this

opinion

opinion began to get much ground, divers of the Fathers did oppose it. Even S. *Justin* (*Dialogo cum Tryphone circa medium*) whom yours use so commonly to alledge for this opinion, in plain words telleth you, *Multos, qui pura pieque sunt Christianorum sententia hoc non agnoscere.* That many (note the word *many*) who are of a pure and pious Christian opinion do not acknowledge this. And your own learned Doctor *Ha* in *his view of &c. Page* 87. 88, 89. doth prove the weaknes of that place in St. *Justin* not to conclude any thing against Catholike Tradition. *Nicephorus* will tell you L. 3. C. 21. that *Papias* Bishop of *Hierapolis* was the first author of this opinion. The traditions of the Church have no first authors but the Apostles.

Of my 28th. Number.

Wherefore by all you have hitherto said, my Argument remaineth unanswered and is really unanswerable the supposition being admitted upon which it is spoken. For tell me whether any Church, which teacheth her self to be fallible can be truely infallible. If any such Church can be infallible, and all Churches be such but the Roman, then Christ can have no Church upon Earth to be our infallible Judge but the Roman. Wherefore no tollerable Answer being yet given to this argument, I will be as good as my word when I said in this Number, *That this being a demonstration I should hold my self bound to say no more until this argument were answered.* Here then I end: yet when you shall have solved this argument, I shal be ready to make good my promise concerning what I said I could and would shew of the Roman Church to soon as I should see this argument answered.

*Petræ duritiem nulli magis, quam ferienti nota.*

FINIS.

## *An Anſwer to your laſt Paper.*

*Ttulus Libri ſæpe legendus eſt*, as the Rule is, the Title of a Book is often to be read; as if it were not to be cenſured: yet in point of controverſie, it may be conſidered. And ſurely your Title [*How in theſe times, in which there be ſo many Religions, the true Religion may certainly be found out*] might be found peccant: For, firſt it ſuppoſeth that which is falſe; that every difference makes a new Religion. 2. It doth not ſuppoſe that which is true; that there are many differences amongſt your ſelves. And thirdly, it doth, in a ſort, infer that which is true and falſe together, and ſo a contradiction; that there are many Religions, and yet but one. And ſo we need ſay no more of it; for thus it ſhould deſtroy it ſelf.

As for the dedication of the Paper *to the Reader*, what do you mean? would you have me onely a Reader of it, as if I could not, or would not, make any return to it? Or do you, as I may conceive, intend it for publick uſe? We are agreed; let the world have it and judge.

In your firſt and ſecond Paragraphs of your Preface to the laſt, you give a repetitional account of your former Treatiſe; and of the order of it, which you ſubſtrate to the order of your Anſwer to my Anſwer of that Treatiſe, and to the Application of it.

Your order ſimply affirmes nothing : therefore we ſay nothing to it.

In the third Par. You excuſe your not making a ſixth chapter to anſwer my anſwer to your Concluſion, and to ſome perſonall debates which concerne not the maine cauſe. The Excuſe ſhall paſſe with me; who, in regard of perſonal quarrels, am as ready to neglect my ſelf, as he would have me. And ſurely if we did not ſeek our ſelves in the ſearch of truth, we ſhould leſſe loſe our ſelves and finde truth ſooner.

So then all I have to do is to anſwer your five chapters, wherein you ſay you anſwer my reply to your Treatiſe.

And in the firſt chap. you include the defence of your preface to the former Treatiſe.

My firſt words did intimate, you ſay ; that I did feare leſt my ſilence ſhould make you ſeem to your ſelf or others to have got the victory, you returne ; *your reply is moſt welcome in this reſpect, that it doth more helpe me than your ſilence could. Not to ſeem to have got but really to get that victory which I deſire not to my ſelf but to truth. For the examination of your reply will ſerve for a touchſtone to my Arguments.* As to this anſwer of yours I have no minde to oppoſe much. Only I am well aſſured that you make the beſt advantage you can of your adverſaries ſilence. And if you can make better advantage of any thing I have written to confirme you then by my ſilence, my words are in your power unto all reaſonable uſe; let them have their natural liberty to ſpeak no more than they are willing to. Do not ſtraine or wreſt them for your turne. For ſo you will alter the property of them and make them yours.

*At male dum recitas incipit eſſe tuus.*

But whereas you ſay, *the examination of your Reply will*

*will ſerve for a touchſtone to my arguments*, you will give me leave to make uſe alſo of the words, and I ſhall be of that opinion in this ſenſe of mine, that, if you conſider it well, it will indeed be a touchſtone to prove your argument, not to be ſolid and true mettall. All is not gold that gliſters.

You ſay *I will follow you as you deſire ſtep after ſtep & κατ' ἀκρίβ.* Anſ. If you do, this is the firſt time you have done ſo. Your firſt did not. Your ſecond did not. If this does, you will be more punctual in the diſpute than your party is wont to be. And whether ſo or not we ſhall ſee in the concluſion. And alſo then you wrong your ſelf in calling this paper alſo a Treatiſe.

Par. 2. *To ſhew the neceſſity of treating the matter I had undertaken I ſaid, that ſuch a manner of reading the Scripture as is permitted by you to all ſorts of people with ſo unlimited a licenſe to interpret them according to their own private judgement of diſcretion is a thing moſt apt to cauſe a numberleſſe number of ſects and hereſies.*

Anſ. Conſider with your ſelf whether you deale honeſtly with us in reporting our opinion in this matter. Do I, or any of us, give ſuch unlimited licenſe to interpret them according to their own private judgment or diſcretion?

But this was neceſſary for your turn, that ſo you might make your argument better: and therefore, when you ſaw by my anſwer that your reading of the Scripture freely permitted to the people is not of it ſelf guilty of thoſe effects, you now add that which is falſe, that *we give ſuch unlimited licenſe to all ſorts of people to interpret the Scripture according to their private judgement of diſcretion.* Now chuſe you which you will ſtand to; that in your Treatiſe, or this in the anſwer, and then put it into form of diſcourſe; and we

opinion began to get much ground, divers of the Fathers did oppose it. Even S. *Justin* (*Dialogo cum Triphone circa medium*) whom yours use so commonly to alledge for this opinion, in plain words telleth you, *Multos, qui pura piaque sunt Christianorum sententia hoc non agnoscere.* That many (note the word *many*) who are of a pure and pious Christian opinion do not acknowledge this. And your own learned Doctor *Ha* in his view &c. Page 87. 88, 89. doth prove the weaknes of that place in St. *Justin* not to conclude any thing against Catholike Tradition. *Nicephorus* will tell you L. 3. C. 21. that *Papias* Bishop of *Hierapolis* was the first author of this opinion. The traditions of the Church have no first authors but the Apostles.

Of my 28th. Number.

Wherefore by all you have hitherto said, my Argument remaineth unanswered and is really unanswerable the supposition being admitted upon which it is spoken. For tell me whether any Church, which teacheth her self to be fallible can be truely infallible. If any such Church can be infallible, and all Churches be such but the Roman, then Christ can have no Church upon Earth to be our infallible Judge but the Roman. Wherefore no tollerable Answer being yet given to this argument, I will be as good as my word when I said in this Number, *That this being a demonstration I should hold my self bound to say no more until this argument were answered.* Here then I end: yet when you shall have solved this argument, I shal be ready to make good my promise concerning what I said I could and would shew of the Roman Church to soon as I should see this argument answered.

*Petræ durities nulli magis, quàm ferienti nota.*

FINIS.

## *An Anſwer to your laſt Paper.*

*Titulus Libri ſæpe legendus eſt*, as the Rule is, the Title of a Book is often to be read; as if it were not to be cenſured: yet in point of controverſie, it may be conſidered. And ſurely your Title [*How in theſe times, in which there be ſo many Religions, the true Religion may certainly be found out*] might be found peccant: For, firſt it ſuppoſeth that which is falſe; that every difference makes a new Religion. 2. It doth not ſuppoſe that which is true; that there are many differences amongſt your ſelves. And thirdly, it doth, in a ſort, infer that which is true and falſe together, and ſo a contradiction; that there are many Religions, and yet but one. And ſo we need ſay no more of it; for thus it ſhould deſtroy it ſelf.

As for the dedication of the Paper *to the Reader*, what do you mean? would you have me onely a Reader of it, as if I could not, or would not, make any return to it? Or do you, as I may conceive, intend it for publick uſe? We are agreed; let the world have it and judge.

In your firſt and ſecond Paragraphs of your Preface to the laſt, you give a repetitional account of your former Treatiſe, and of the order of it, which you ſubſtrate to the order of your Anſwer to my Anſwer of that Treatiſe, and to the Application of it.

Your order ſimply affirmes nothing : therefore we ſay nothing to it.

In the third Par. You excuſe your not making a ſixth chapter to anſwer my anſwer to your Concluſion, and to ſome perſonall debates which concerne not the maine cauſe. The Excuſe ſhall paſſe with me; who, in regard of perſonal quarrels, am as ready to neglect my ſelf, as he would have me. And ſurely if we did not ſeek our ſelves in the ſearch of truth, we ſhould leſſe loſe our ſelves and finde truth ſooner.

So then all I have to do is to anſwer your five chapters, wherein you ſay you anſwer my reply to your Treatiſe.

And in the firſt chap. you include the defence of your preface to the former Treatiſe.

My firſt words did intimate, you ſay ; that I did feare leſt my ſilence ſhould make you ſeem to your ſelf or others to have got the victory, you returne ; *your reply is moſt welcome in this reſpect, that it doth more helpe me than your ſilence could. Not to ſeem to have got but really to get that victory which I deſire not to my ſelf but to truth. For the examination of your reply will ſerve for a touchſtone to my Arguments.* As to this anſwer of yours I have no minde to oppoſe much. Only I am well aſſured that you make the beſt advantage you can of your adverſaries ſilence. And if you can make better advantage of any thing I have written to confirme you then by my ſilence, my words are in your power unto all reaſonable uſe; let them have their natural liberty to ſpeak no more than they are willing to. Do not ſtraine or wreſt them for your turne. For ſo you will alter the property of them and make them yours.

*At male dum recitas incipit eſſe tuus.*

But whereas you ſay, *the examination of your Reply will*

*will ſerve for a touchſtone to my arguments*, you will give me leave to make uſe alſo of the words, and I ſhall be of that opinion in this ſenſe of mine, that, if you conſider it well, it will indeed be a touchſtone to prove your argument, not to be ſolid and true mettall. All is not gold that gliſters.

You ſay *I will follow you as you deſire ſtep after ſtep & κατ' πόδα*. Anſ. If you do, this is the firſt time you have done ſo. Your firſt did not. Your ſecond did not. If this does, you will be more punctual in the diſpute than your party is wont to be. And whether ſo or not we ſhall ſee in the concluſion. And alſo then you wrong your ſelf in calling this paper alſo a Treatiſe.

Par. 2. *To ſhew the neceſſity of treating the matter I had undertaken I ſaid, that ſuch a manner of reading the Scripture as is permitted by you to all ſorts of people with ſo unlimited a licenſe to interpret them according to their own private judgement of diſcretion is a thing moſt apt to cauſe a numberleſſe number of ſects and hereſies.*

Anſ. Conſider with your ſelf whether you deale honeſtly with us in reporting our opinion in this matter. Do I, or any of us, give ſuch unlimited licenſe to interpret them according to their own private judgment or diſcretion?

But this was neceſſary for your turn, that ſo you might make your argument better: and therefore, when you ſaw by my anſwer that your reading of the Scripture freely permitted to the people is not of it ſelf guilty of thoſe effects, you now add that which is falſe, that *we give ſuch unlimited licenſe to all ſorts of people to interpret the Scripture according to their private judgement of diſcretion*. Now chuſe you which you will ſtand to; that in your Treatiſe, or this in the anſwer, and then put it into form of diſcourſe; and we

anſwer you. If you ſay, as in the Treatiſe, *that if there were a free permitting of the uſe of the Bible to all ſorts of people in their mother tongue, it would not fail, but multitudes of new ſects and hereſies would grow up; and as for the peoples manners, they would daily grow worſe and worſe*: then we deny your propoſition, as before, underſtanding it in way of cauſe, or if you will hold it of us in this anſwer, that we do freely permit to all ſorts of people *to interpret the Scripture accor-to their private judgement of diſcretion*, we deny your aſſumption, for though we allow the judgement of private diſcretion negatively, that nothing ſhould be obtruded upon us for point of faith which we ſee not in our judgment of diſcretion to be agreeable to Scripture: yet do we not give any licenſe to any poſitively to interpret according to the judgement of private diſcretion, but according to the analogy of faith, and alſo we commend to them the peruſal of the judgment of others, Fathers and Doctors, in points of difficulty, private judgment herein makes not the interpretation; but is to make conſent to it.

2. we can diſtinguiſh of your predicate here [*is a thing moſt apt to cauſe a numberleſſe number of ſects and hereſies*] There is a double aptitude either in the nature of the thing, or by accident of our corruption. The former is denied in the caſe, the latter makes no prejudice. For ſo Scholars ſhould not read the Bible neither, becauſe it gives occaſion of differences and the Goſpell ſhould be taken away for feare of bad accidents. *Sapiens non curat de accidentalibus.*

But you prove your ſuppoſition and firſt *a priori* thus *you permitt any Artificer who can reach to take the Bible into his hand and to take it for his ſole and only Judge of all neceſſary controverſies, &c.* along unto theſe words *falling into hereſie*, incluſively. Anſ. If this your diſcourſe *a priori*? To it we might

might ſay much: firſt, there is ſomewhat in the premiſes which we do not in their propriety affirme, as namely, that they are to take the Scripture for the *ſole and onely Judge in all neceſſary controverſies*: we ſay properly and formally, Scripture is not the judge, but as the Law and rule by which judgement is to be given in controverſies neceſſary.

2. We do not allow him to make a *review of what is decreed in a Generall Councell* as in order to any other but onely for himſelf. He hath no autoritative judgement reſpecting others; but a rationall judgement reſpecting himſelf. So you ſay that of us which we do not ſay. And then again, you will not ſay of us that which we do ſay, which ſhould ſpoyle the Argumentation: for though we ſay he may not (for he cannot) ſubmit his judgement to a Generall Councell, unleſſe he ſees what is determined thereby to be true, yet may he ſubmit his perſon unto cenſure, and ſo not oppoſe the Church Repreſentative. Again 3. In this your Argument you do not conclude home; for you conclude, this is but to *leave men in a mighty hazard of miſunderſtanding the word of God and falling into hereſie*. So then, upon the whole matter, this argumentation of yours is not good; becauſe ſomewhat in it, nay, much is denied; and ſomewhat not by you allowed, as it ſhould be: and then it concludes but accidentally; if probably, not neceſſarily; if neceſſarily, not demonſtratively; if demonſtratively, not *a priori*; for it doth not, by way of a certain efficient cauſe, induce the concluſion of hereſie; nor is hereſie the finall cauſe of our intending this liberty to the people. Therfore be not ſo forward in high termes of your ratiocination. Yea, if this allowance to the people did certainly, and by way of Emanation, produce hereſie, it would not of it ſelf produce any more than materiall hereſie in points of neceſſary faith (which

which need not be brought into queſtion)not hereſie formal, which imports oppoſition to the Church. And this reſpect of hereſie you do ſurely bend the bow againſt. Indeed every oppoſition doth import diſcent: but every diſcent (which is more generall) doth not actually import an oppoſition.

So your long ſillogiſme *a priori* is but lanke, nor doth your reaſoning *a poſteriori* thrive: thus, *In thoſe places where the ſacred Scriptures are thus proſtituted, not only to the bare reading, but alſo to the interpretation of every profane and ignorant fellow (I ſtill meane when he ſhall have heard or ſeen what can be alleadged on all ſides) theſe and only theſe ſects have multiplied, and do multiply, beyond meaſure.* Anſ. If the Scripture be allowed to every ones uſe for the knowledge of things neceſſary to ſalvation, it is no proſtitution of it. *Bellarmin*, as before in his 1.*b*.*c*.1. *de Verbo Dei*, affirms it to be our rule, then a rule to all; then it is neceſſary by neceſſity of precept, and by neceſſity of mean too, upon the account of a rule: if you ſpeak of a proſtitution of it to every ones interpretation according to his own fanſy. This is not intended by us. But what power hath the Church to hinder them of their right? If they abuſe their liberty, it is upon their own perill. They wreſt the Scripture to their own deſtruction, as St. *Peter* ſaid of ſome, that they wreſted ſome things in St. *Paul's* Epiſtles which are hard to be underſtood. And as *Dominion* Civill is not grounded in grace ſpeciall: ſo neither is the religious right of Scripture grounded in ſpeciall knowledge. And if they be more ignorant, they have more need of it.

2. The parentheſis you adde to ſtrengthen your argument or to qualifie the ſtate of your queſtion, makes nothing for you. For if you underſtand the words [*I ſtill meane when he ſhall have heard or ſeen what can be alleadged on all ſides*] as to ſtrengthen your Argu-

Argument, it ſurely weakens it. For if they heare or ſee what is alleadged on all ſides, they are not like to follow their own conceit, but what appears to be more reaſonable. For your argument ſuppoſeth that after they have heard or ſeen all that can be ſaid on all ſides, yet they have liberty from us to interpret according to their own pleaſure; which is more unlikely they would do, though they had our allowance after they had heard or ſeen all that could be alleadged on all ſides. If you intend thoſe words to qualify the ſtate of the queſtion, then it ſeems before they do hear or ſee what is alleadged on all ſides they may not paſſe any judgement of the point for themſelves: and if they muſt firſt heare or ſee all that can be alleadged on all ſides before they take that ſenſe that is agreeable to plain places of Scripture, then ſurely they muſt be blind as to this point; for, when ſhall they be able probably to know whether they have heard or ſeen all that can be alleadged on all ſides in ſuch a matter? This is ſuch a yoke which the *Phariſees* (if we may ſay ſo) lay upon us which neither they nor their Fathers were able to bear. But, 3. Whereas you ſay theſe and only theſe ſects have multiplied & do multiply beyond meaſure, it is falſe on both parts; (not theſe always which you muſt mean) for why then did the ancient Fathers exhort the people ſo much to the ſtudy of the Scripture, as *Cyrill* of *Jeruſalem*, and S. *Chryſoſtom*, the former in his Catechiſm, the later in his Comments, and alſo in homilies? And then not *only there*; for then you might propoſe a convenient way to take away all the differences amongſt the *Jeſuites* and *Dominicans* and thoſe that divide from the court of *Rome*, namely, by taking away all uſe of Scripture. You ſee, not only by ignorant and profane men, there are bred differences where the Bible is in liberty; but amongſt the learned men alſo.

So

So that not always theſe, nor only theſe, *theſe are ſects*. But 4. The multiplying of ſects, and beyond meaſure, is not, as hath been ſaid, the effect of the uſe thereof; becauſe not neceſſary. And doth not your argument follow by conſequence only? then not by neceſſity of conſequent. And therefore is not this a demonſtration *a poſteriori?*

Thus you have argued καταπδαστικῶς: let us now ſee how happy you are ἀναπδαστικῶς, in refutation of my anſwers.

This we have in the third par. *Neither do any of your arguments prove this not to be the true cauſe of hereſie and bad life, which followeth hereſie.* Anſ. Here we ſee you intended a full demonſtration from the cauſe. But whereas you ſay none of my arguments do prove the contrary; you may remember that I had no arguments but in way of anſwer. It is not my office to diſpute but anſwer. Whereas you ſay bad life followeth hereſy; that you meane inſeparably, do you not? If you do not, it is inconſequent; if you do, it is falſe. How many Hereticks have been more ſtrict in their lives then orthodox Chriſtians, that they might gaine more credit to their error. by holineſſe of life as *Socinus* and others.

You come then to refute my arguments. *Firſt it is ſo far from being contrary from that text, you err, not knowing the Scriptures, that it is moſt agreeable to it. For a moſt fit way to erre againſt the knowledge of the Scripture is to permit ſuch and a great number of ſuch men to interpret Scriptures, as are moſt fit to erre in the interpretation of them.* And is this a good refutation? And therefore the meaning of our Saviour muſt be according to your uſe, they erred becauſe they have the knowledge of the Scriptures, which they miſ-interpreted Shift you how you will you cannot evade, was the knowledge of the

the Scriptures the cauſe of their error? no: that is contrary to our Saviour, who ſaid, you err, not knowing the Scriptures: was it neceſſary that thoſe who did know the Scriptures ſhould miſ-interpret them? no; for then that will, by a recideration, come into the ſame inconvenience; for then the knowledge will be a certain mean (at leaſt in a large ſenſe) of this miſ-interpretation. And ſo it would be our beſt way to know nothing of Scripture, that ſo we may not err. 3. Can we imagine that our Saviour Chriſt diſcourſed as you do, that becauſe by our fault the Scriptures are an occaſion of miſ-interpretation, therefore the people ſhould not commonly uſe them? is this ſymbolicall to the ſenſe of our Saviour's words, you err, not knowing the Scriptures? 4. Our Saviour then by you rebukes their miſ-interpretation: then he would have them know the Scriptures better, not have the people deprived of them. 5. There is a double knowledge as to this purpoſe. 1. An habituall Knowledge, which is chiefly of the Principles in Scripture; this they had in their mind. Then there is an actuall Knowledge, which conſiſts in an application of thoſe Principles to particular Concluſions of belief and practiſe. They were wanting it ſeems in the later; in that they did not ſo as they ſhould conſider that text in *Moſes*, which our Saviour makes uſe of for the Reſurrection. They might have inferred the Reſurrection from that text, and ſo not have erred. Therefore had they more need to look over the Scriptures again and conſider them better. The ſaying of the Jew is good. He that reads a book an hundred times is not like him that readeth it an hundred times and one. The oftner we read it, eſpecially the Bible, the more we ſee in it.

But you bring a corroboration of your anſwer, *ſpecially being licenſed to croſs all Antiquity and all the Au-*

*thority of the Church if they ſtand in their way.* Sir, this will not do. 1. We licence them not to croſſe all Antiquity, & we need not give them ſuch a direction, and ſurely if they ſhould you would have no cauſe to blame them. We have liberty to uſe that of the Philoſopher in his Rhet. ὁ καλὸν ἐναντία κρίνει τῷ Θεῷ τῷ Παῖδι ἢ τῷ Διδασκάλῳ. Do you look to that who contradict God and Fathers and Doctors. 2. They cannot intend ſurely the croſſing of all Antiquity; for certainly they do not know all Antiquity; yea, if you ſpeak *all Antiquity* with a full univerſality, there are few of your own learned men that know it. And therefore if any of their interpretations doth croſſe antiquity, it doth but ἀντιπίπτειν, it is but by accident. And in things neceſſary they are not ſo like to do ſo. 3. Who is there of all your men that have proved this propoſition, that the Conſent of the Fathers (ſuppoſed) makes an argument of Divine Faith, therefore though we love their company, yet we deſire to ſee our way. But object to us nothing but that which is proper. How ſhall your men know that what they hold doth not croſſe all Antiquity? The Authority of the Church gives them neither faith of it nor Knowledge. Yea ſome of yours ſay, *omnes Patres ſic, ego autem non ſic.*

You go on. *And I wonder why you call this your manner of proceeding the knowledge of the Scripture, &c.* unto ſecondly. Anſ. You make your ſelf ſport with the Ambiguity of the word *Knowledge.* You mean it by way of a Science, as Phyſick: we do not ſay that Trades-men make any knowledge of Divinity ſo, as to give an account of the principles of Divinity in the body of it: no, but they may have a knowledge of Scripture ſufficient for their uſe, although they do not teach others. As if there were plain principles of Phyſick in our language; we might make uſe of

them for our ſelves, as *Tiberius* ſaid, after thirty years of age he would laugh at thoſe who did need a Phyſitian, you are deceived then, or would deceive in the fallacie of conſequent, though all Science be knowledge, all knowledge is not Science; for knowledge is more generall and therefore ſurely of it ſelf doth not inferre the moſt perfect ſpecies.

You ſay, *ſecondly, you in vaine object that of St. Paul that the Scriptures are able to make us wiſe unto Salvation*, &c. unto thirdly; wherein you allow the truth of the text with your gloſs; namely, not as they are *interpreted by every giddy fanſie*, but by Tim. *who did continue in the things which he learned and had been aſſured of by orall tradition.*

Anſ. Καὶ τί πλέον; what will you get by this anſwer? If you underſtand by orall tradition ſuch doctrines of the Goſpell which were firſt preached, afterwards written, we grant you the uſe of ſuch orall traditions: but this boots you not; for you muſt have traditions in point of faith, beſides what is written: and ſuch we deny unto you that *Timothy* had. And I prove my deniall by your own words. For how could *Timothy* underſtand Scripture by what was beſide Scripture? you ſpeake of his underſtanding the Scripture by tradition: tradition, of proper name, is that which is beſide Scripture in the matter of it: and how can he, by that which is different in matter, underſtand the Scripture? If you mean by orall Traditions, ſome traditive interpretations (as learned men call them) of the more difficult paſſages of Scripture, this indeed were more reaſonable in the hypotheſis as to *Timothy*: but this is nothing to us, unleſſe you can tell us certainly how many and what they are. If there were ſuch, and loſt, then your Church is loſt. 2. Againe, we allow no giddy fanſie to define the ſenſe of Scripture; but in things neceſſary and plain

their own knowledge may be ſufficient, and their private judgement may be as ſafely exerciſed in the ſence thereof as in the choice of your Religion.

But thirdly by your own words, I will conclude againſt you *a fortiori*; for if the Scriptures were able to make *Timothy* wiſe, who was a Teacher, much more others: ſince, as Mr. *Creſſy* and you afterwards affirm, there is more requiſite to a Miniſter to be believed than others. If then they be able to make a Miniſter wiſe unto ſalvation, then one of the People much more, who, according to you, is not bound to ſo much. Fourthly, whereas you ſay, *They* (ſo) *will make him wiſe unto ſalvation, and to continue ſtill aſſured of the doctrine of the Church, and never to contradict that.* Do not you ſee that you add to *Paul* in the Predicate: for S. *Paul* ſaies, they are able to make him wiſe unto ſalvation: and you ſay, [ſo] they are able to make him wiſe to ſalvation, and to continue ſtill aſſured of the Doctrine of the Church, and not to contradict the Church: who is it that wreſts Scripture now? Do not you draw it to your own uſe? no, you will ſay; it is all one to make us wiſe unto ſalvation, and to make us continue ſtill aſſured of the Doctrine of the Church, and not to contradict the Church. Is it? then all who have not contradicted the Church are ſaved: & none that have contradicted the Church are ſaved. The former you will not ſay: the later you cannot prove. Pope *Vigilius* contradicted the Church in the 5. Gen. Council, about the three Chapters; was he damned? Fifthly, you ſay, the Scriptures ſo underſtood, would make him wiſe unto ſalvation, and to continue in the doctrine of the Church. How do you underſtand it, copulatively, or disjunctively? Copulatively, that the Scriptures and the orall traditions would make him wiſe unto ſalvation, and to continue in the doctrine of the Church? or disjunctively, that the Scriptures would make him

wiſe

wiſe unto ſalvation, and the traditions to continue in the doctrine of the Church? If disjunctively, then we may be wiſe unto ſalvation, and yet not continue in the doctrine of the Church; to wit, by the Scriptures. If we cannot have ſalvation without continuing in the Church, then prove your Church to be as infallible to us, as the Doctors of the Church were to *Timothy*, until that time you will be thought to beg the queſtion. So, to end this anſwer, we note here, that you take ſpecial care of the Church. It ſeems by your ſtickling about the Church, that what S. *Auſtin* ſaid, in his *de Civitate Dei*, concerning *Rome*-Heathen, is alſo true by you of *Rome*-Chriſtian, *Et major cura unius Romæ quam totius Cœli:* And there is more care had of one *Rome* than all Heaven. You go on. *Thirdly*, you ſay; *You confeſs that when we are by the Church aſſured that the Scripture is the Word of God, we may ground our faith in it for thoſe things which are plainly delivered.* You ſay *yes, but I alſo ſay, that all things neceſſary to ſalvation are not plainly delivered in Scripture.*

So then, it ſeems you come downe from your former univerſality, that whatſoever we do believe, we muſt believe upon the propoſals of the Church, as the formal cauſe and motive thereof; and why then do you not allow the people the uſe of the Bible, as in order to thoſe things which are plainly delivered? So that by this conceſſion you open the way to contradict your own practice.

But you would ſhut it again, by ſaying, that *all things neceſſary to ſalvation are not plainly delivered in it.* Be ſure you take heed of this, that you do not grant this: for why then ſhould all fly to the Church for infalible directions in way of ſupply? well. Are they not delivered, or not plainly? which? ſpeak your mind. If not delivered, then ſurely not plainly;

plainly; for of that which is not there are no affections, as the Rule is; but they may be delivered, and yet not plainly. Come out of the clouds, and do not make a noiſe, but lighten us. If not delivered, think upon the Argument you know well, *If many things not neceſſary are plainly delivered in Scripture, then much rather all things neceſſary.* If delivered and not plainly, then plainly not delivered; for if they be delivered, they are delivered for our uſe, as a Rule of faith and action: and how are they a Rule, if they be not ſufficiently plain? for then we muſt have another Rule for the underſtanding of this Rule. And alſo think upon the former Argument, which proceeds upon your own diſtinction, that the Scriptures were able to make *Timothy* wiſe unto ſalvation, but not every one. If *Timothy*, then much more others, becauſe more is required, as you ſay, to a Miniſter, in point of belief, than to others.

But you would prove what you ſay *S. Peter ſaith, that many, to their perdition, did miſunderſtand ſome hard places of S. Paul; ſo that miſ-interpretation of hard places may be the cauſe of perdition.* Anſ. Firſt you will excuſe us if we note that the danger they were in, was not by miſunderſtanding, but by wreſting of thoſe places. You know the Greek is, as before was ſaid, στρεβλοῦσι· And the Syriack renders it, *perverting, depraving*: and ſo alſo your Tranſlation of *Rhemes, depraving.* This is not ſo much an intellectual error, as a moral fault, and the danger is by the later. Secondly, Here's but ſome things hard to be underſtood in S. *Paul's* Epiſtles, not all; not many: and from hence you cannot argue, that all things therefore in S. *Paul's* Epiſtles, and much leſſe in the whole Scripture, are hard to be underſtood. If you ſyllogize ſo, you proceed *a particulari, & a dicto ſecundum quid.* Thirdly, the perverting and depraving doth more immediately

diately depend upon their being unſtable than ignorant. Therefore cannot you impute that to ſimple ignorance, which, at leaſt partly, belongs to another cauſe. Fourthly, how prove you that thoſe things which were hard to be underſtood, were of thoſe things which are neceſſary to ſalvation? If you ſay ſo, it lies upon you to prove it; if they were not ſuch, then this text is not pertinent. Fifthly, it is to their own deſtruction, πρὸς τὴν ἰδίαν αὐτῶν ἀπώλειαν. So then it ſeems hereby they had the liberty to read thoſe Epiſtles: and why ſhould you therefore hinder the people from the uſe of *Scripture*, ſince they run the danger of their own deſtruction by wreſting them? And peruſe your own *Eſtius* upon the place, who doth ingenuouſly note, that it is not ſaid ὧν αἷς, as referring to the Epiſtle (as ſome copies he ſaid would have it) but ὧν ἷς, referring to περὶ τούτων, which reſpects the time of Chriſts coming; although afterwards *Eſtius* would extend them to the point of juſtification by faith.

*Fourthly, you object hereſie and lewd life to ſome in whom you ſay we inveſted infallibility. If I ſhould grant all, what prove you from hence, but that there be other ways to hereſie and bad life beſides giving all ſcope to interpret the Scriptures as we judge fit? &c.* unto *but to prevent.*

Anſ. But do you remember what occaſion I had to object this to you by way of recrimination? you charged us by the judgement of your learned Divines that the free uſe of the Scripture would be *it upon which the peoples manners would grow worſe and worſe.* And to this I ſaid, how comes it then to paſſe that ſome in whom you veſted infallibilitie were guiltie of hereſie and bad manners? and I inſtanced in *Liberius* ſubſcribing againſt *Athanaſius.* So that the way your Church hath doth not free you from theſe crimes: and therefore you do unreaſonably urge againſt your Adverſary

verſarie inconveniences of his principles, which are common to yours. And yet you will now complain of me becauſe I am even with you.

The debate betwixt us upon this point lies thus; you faulted our permiſſion of the uſe of Scripture to the people as the cauſe, or the cauſe without which hereſie and bad manners do not ariſe. I anſwered in defence of Scripture, this not the cauſe nor the *cauſa ſine quæ non* of them, ſince hereſie and bad manners have been in thoſe of your Church in whom your infalibility is placed, and therefore have you no cauſe to take it ſo ill that I anſwered you ſo home. All the cauſality you can pretend of hereſie and bad manners by a free uſe of the Scriptures, is through miſ-interpretation of them; is it not? yea? is it ſo? then how come thoſe who are infalible to be hereticks and bad? You had beſt take away Scripture from all, that ſo there may be no hereſie.

Well, it ſeems you now begin to bethink your ſelf that hereſie and bad life are not the properties of a free uſe of Scripture, as we underſtand them *quarto modo*; but as conſequents, or inſeparable accidents w^ch are in a larger ſenſe as properties, namely, as *omni ſed non ſoli*; ſo I conſtrue your laſt words [*if I ſhould grant all, what prove you from hence but that there be other ways to hereſie and bad life*] &c. you muſt then allow us to tell you, that you are ſomewhat diſpoſed to go hence, and to deduct and refute the overboiling expreſſions of the danger of Scripture, as to the people at leaſt, as if all the hereſies and bad life were to be grounded or charged upon the common liberty of reading Scripture. And let me come up a little more cloſely to you; I demand of you whether you will or dare to ſay, that all thoſe who have had the free uſe of Scripture have interpreted it [in difficult places] as they judged fit, and therefore were of bad life:

if

if not then, is it not *proprium omni?* And ſo for, hereſie, you cannot ſay, that every one who hath freely uſed Scripture hath interpreted or miſ-interpreted it unto hereſie, for how then could he of your Church ſay, *ſi fides in doctos ſolos caderet, nihil eſſet, occuperius Deos?* Or did they believe without the uſe of Scripture by an implicit faith in the Church? Did they? But this implicit faith implies a contradiction *in adjecto*, for faith ſuppoſeth knowledge of what we believe in the object, though not in the reaſon: but implicit is divided againſt knowledge: and if you ſay, that it knows the Church which it doth believe, it will come to this, that all the faith of the people ſhall be ſhrunk into one Article of the Church; and no matter whether they explicitly believe God or Chriſt or any thing elſe, will this prove good Divinity? Or will good Divinity prove this? And beſides, it is not implicit faith which believes the Church, but explicit; for they muſt actually believe the Roman Church to be it unto which ſalvation is obliged. Then reading of the Scriptures is not a cauſe to all, though not all the cauſe of hereſie; for ſome have got ſalvation by it; and therefore were no hereticks, unleſs you will ſay, they might have ſalvation and be hereticks too. If you will ſay it, then why would you perſwade our people that there is no ſalvation for us hereticks? Then ſubjection to the Roman Church is not neceſſary to ſalvation; for although all Chriſtians but you, according to your Principles, are hereticks, yet they may be ſaved becauſe hereticks may be ſaved. However we may have faith by reading of Scripture; and if faith, then we are not hereticks, by *Knots* argumentation; becauſe he would have hereſie deſtroy all faith. But you have reaſon to ſay that other ways of hereſie there may be beſides being converſant in Scripture: for you know that hereticks have pleaded Antiquity, therefore by your Logick,

you ſhould not plead it for uſe and ſettlement of faith.

Whereas you ſay, *Again, had not David who was a Murtherer and an Adulterer; had not Solomon who was an Idolater the infalible aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt, in writing ſeverall parts of the holy Scripture?*

Sir, I thank you for helping your weak Adverſary; for this makes for me, and proves for me what I ſaid on behalf of Scripture, that hereſie and badneſſe were accidentall at moſt to the uſe of Scripture, becauſe thoſe whom you account infallible were guilty thereof. You prove now, by other examples, the poſſibility thereof. The ſenſe of the diſcourſe, as to badneſſe of life, is this. If bad manners be competible to thoſe who are accounted infallible, then the miſ-interpretation of Scripture, by the ignorance of the people, is not the cauſe of bad maners, but *verum prius*; and now you, not denying it to be true of your Pope, would confirm it by certain examples in Scripture. But I hope you meane to reflect this towards the proof of infalibility to be conſiſtent with a lewd life. And therefore I anſwer to you that I deny not the diſtinction of infalibility *in rebus fidei*, and not in point of action. I deny not the diſtinction in the notion of it, but I deny it in the application of it to the Pope. I do acknowledge him in one part of it, falible, in the latter; but you muſt prove him infalible in the former, as *David* and *Solomon* was: and we have done. We are agreed in the *Theſis*, that there may be infalibility of faith where there is lewdneſs of life, but we differ in the *Hypotheſis*, as you intend it; not that the Pope may not be nought in life: but that he is not infalible in defining points of faith or manners.

But you would avoid the danger of my former anſwer; therefore you ſay, *But to prevent this and all that elſewhere you can ſay againſt the Pope: I (in my twenty*

*ty first number) desired you and all to take notice of that which you here quite forget. I said I would have every one to know that the Roman Church doth oblige us no more than to believe that the Pope, defining with a lawfull Councell, cannot erre. How then doth the belief or faith of a Church (I speake not of private mens private opinions) invest infalibility in a person hereticall or bad?*

So then let my answer be put into this forme. *Liberius* the Pope was guilty of heresie and bad manners. *Liberius* was (according to you) infalible; therefore the Subject of infalibility may be an heretick, and guiltie of bad manners, and consequently heresie and bad life are not to be imputed to the misinterpretation of Scripture. Before you graunted me the Conclusion, that heresie and bad life may come in otherwise; and therefore we cannot fasten them upon the mis-interpretation of Scripture: and now you denie to me the Assumption, and you say the Church doth not invest infalibility in the Pope, *but as defining with a lawfull Councell*, generall you meane.

Well then, *Liberius* is not defended in the point of subscription as neither you nor *Bellarmin* can defend him: but yet you defend the Roman infalibility in faith; because, as you say, he was not the Subject of it. Rather than infalibilitie should be disparaged, the Pope shall be degraded from his infalibilitie.

This you say here occasionally, to denie unto me the use of this instance: but this is not the seat of the matter; therefore we shall say here no more than is necessarie. And first you had no great cause here to except against the assumption, since you grant the consequence of the Conclusion. 2. You should consider what you say, that the Pope of himself is not the Subject of infalibilitie, for by this you raise a war against you of your Roman Catholicks, which did

think they knew the ſenſe of the Roman faith, as well as you; for ſure you are not more than a private Doctor. All the Canoniſts you know are againſt you, and the Jeſuites are againſt you, particularly *Bellarmin* in his 2 *b. de Concil. Autor* 15. *Ch.* Where he maintaines this poſition, that the Pope is the Head of the whole Church. Where he hath this argument. *Eccleſia univerſalis eſt unum corpus viſibile, ergo habere debet unum Caput viſibile.* The univerſall Church is one viſible Bodie; therefore it muſt have one viſible Head, otherwiſe it will ſeem a Monſter. But we cannot imagin any other but the Pope. Therefore the Pope is the Head of the whole Church *ſimul* together; ſo he, and that is of a Councill. And ſo it was determined in the *Lateran* Councill. Now where ſhall be the infalibilitie of the Church placed then but in the head of a councill? You are all wont to ſay, that the Church is infalible and a Councel infallible, and that the Pope is infalible. Now how will you com-promiſe the truth of theſe, but by ſaying the Church is infallible by the Councill and the Councell by the Pope. Then the Pope is the πρῶτον δεκτικὸν of this infalibilitie. The Church formally taken is the multitude of the Faithfull; the Church repreſentatively is the Councell, the Church virtually is the Pope. If the firſt ſubject receptive of Autoritybe the people, then do you lay the ground of the Independents: if the Councill, then the Pope hath his power from them, and ſo he is not the immediate Vicar of Chriſt, as *Bell.* in the former *b.* and *ch.* the 15.

And then alſo what will become of the condition of the primitive Church wherein there was ſo long a time before any General Councel? And then alſo in reaſon there ſhould be a General ſtanding Councel, if infalibility primarily flows from them. And have the Council a coordinate power, or ſubordinate? Which will you

you ſay? If coordinate, then to be ſure the Pope is not Head of the Church, which you will be loath to ſay. If ſubordinate, then he is Head, and therefore infalibility muſt be ſubjected in him as Prince of the Church, unleſs you will divide infalibilitie from Authority: And if ſo, what Autoritie will there be of this infalibilitie?

But to go on. You tell me that thoſe *Doctors who are of that opinion that the Pope cannot erre in defining out of a general Councel, have other anſwers to your objections.* So you put me to ſeek for their anſwers. You will not tell me who they are, nor what they are, nor where they are to be found. So then as to them my objections are proper; and their opinions may be as probable or more than yours, and it may ſeem more and therefore you will not condemne your own opinion by comparing with their anſwers: for, if their Anſwers be ſolid, then your opinion is nought.

And then you are pleaſed to put me off thus, *but that which you ſay is nothing againſt our faith, which no man (though never ſo little a French-man) will ſay obligeth us to hold the Pope infallible in defining out of a Generall Councell.*

Anſ. But that which you ſay is nothing againſt the faith of others which no man (though never ſo little a Courtier at *Rome*) will ſay obligeth them to hold the Pope not infalible in defining out of a general Councel. But why do you ſay our faith? Is your faith the ſame with the faith of the *Roman* Court? If not, then you divide from them. If ſo, then you muſt hold that none are true Catholicks (in your ſenſe) but thoſe who hold themſelves ſuch by Subjection to the Biſhop of *Rome*; not as in a Councell, but ſimply to him. Yea, do you not think that you muſt neceſſarily be ſubject to the *Laterean* Councill which had the Popes conſent: and that determined the thing *expreſſiſſime*, as *Bel.* in his ſecond *b. de Concil. cap.* 13. Namely, that the

the Pope is above the Councel in a ſenſe oppoſite to the Counſell of *Conſtance* and *Baſill* who defined a Generall Councell above the Pope, and could infalibly determine without him. And if you ſay that *Bellarmin* ſaid, there ſome did doubt whether the *Laterean* Councell was a generall Councell, yet you muſt tell us your opinion what you hold of this Councel; yea, in his ſeventeenth ch. he defends it for a generall Councel and holds the point to be a decree concerning faith, but ſaies it is a doubt that the Councell did not decree it *proprie ut decretum fide Catholicæ tenendum*; and therefore they that think otherwiſe are not properly hereticks, yet canot be excuſed from great temeritie. However I hope that Councel was more conſiderable with you than the judgment of private Doctors: yea alſo, than the *French Catholicks*. Yea, if you will be a right *French-man* in this opinion, you ſhould hold that the Councell may be infalible *reclamante Papa*, (and this comes up to the ſtreſſe of the queſtion) and therefore you do not ſpeak determinately your opinion concerning the right ſtate of the queſtion: but you do *latere poſt principia*, in ſaying, that no *French-man* will ſay, you are obliged to hold the Pope infalible in defining out a Generall Councell. If you be a *French-man* in this, ſpeak out and tell us your opinion, not conjunctively, but disjunctively, whether the Councell may be infalible without the Pope. But I commend your wiſdome that you hold the ſafeſt way. For this *Bellar.* and all will ſay, that the Pope defining with a Councell cannot erre. But *Bellarmin* will alſo hold infalibilitie to be in the Pope, who is the head of the whole Church, even congregated, and that all Authoritie is in him, as the Monarch of the Church; but in this you are an Ephectick. So certainly you do agree amongſt your ſelves about the Capital point of the *Roman* infalibilitie. As one ſaid in another

ther caſe of action: ſo may I ſay of you in this diſpute: you have firſt ſaid you knew not what: and now you know not what to ſay. Tell us where the originall of infalibilitie lies. κεῖται ἢ κεῖται; οὐ κεῖται; ſurely it doth not become infalibilitie to be ſo reſerved.

To paſſe this, you tell me in your fourth Par. that I lay to your charge the ſuppoſing of the queſtion. And I am ſtill of that minde. For if you ſay, *that as things ſtand, we have no other aſſurance to ground our faith upon but the Church*; you do plainly ſuppoſe that which is mainly in queſtion; and ſo muſt do until you prove it. And I ſtill ſay unto you, as I did, that you do not well conſider what you ſay in ſaying, *as things ſtand*, as if the rule of faith were a *Lesbian* rule, and might alter upon occaſions; and as if the Scripture muſt be accommodated to the uſe of the Church. Yes, *intellectus currit cum praxi*. And the Scripture is to follow the Church, and not the Church the Scripture, would you have it ſo? So it ſeems by what follows, for ſo you anſwer, that, *though God might have ordained otherwiſe, yet as things ſtand, the Church is the ground of our faith in all points, ſpeaking of the laſt ground on which we muſt ſtand; to wit, not an humane but Divine ground, the pillar and ground of truth.* And what do you ſay here more than you ſaid before; or more than we can ſay, *mutatis mutandis*? Though God could have ordained otherwiſe that there ſhould have been a ſtanding Councel, or a ſingular perſon ſucceſſively infalible, to have propoſed and determined all things infalibly: yet, as things ſtand, the Scripture is the ground of our faith in all points neceſſary, ſpeaking of the laſt ground on which we muſt ſtand, not a humane, but a Divine ground. Wherein are we inferiour to you, but that we do not put in *all points*? But we put in all points neceſſarie. And what need more? And the Church is not yet proved to determine

mine any thing infalibly: the Scripture propoſeth all things neceſſary infalibly. And me thinks you ſhould, if you pleaſe, think the Scripture a divine ground rather than the Church.

To take then your own principle.

The ground of faith muſt be Divine.

The Church is not a ground Divine.

Therefore no ground.

The Major is your own. The aſſumption is proved thus.

The Teſtimonie of men is Humane.

The Teſtimonie of the Church is the Teſtimonie of men. Therefore,

The firſt propoſition, in the ordinary capacity of *men* is plaine. For no effect can exceed the cauſe. And the ſecond propoſition is as plaine, if the men that are of the Church are conſidered as private men, by your own grounds. But theſe men you ſay, being in the capacitie of a Church, are inſpired by the Holy Ghoſt ſo as they cannot erre in any point. True, if they be aſſiſted with the Holy Ghoſt. Well, but how ſhall I know what a Church is, and whether ſuch men be of the Church; and whether ſuch men be aſſiſted with the Holy Ghoſt? Yea, whether there be an Holy Ghoſt? All theſe particulars I muſt be ſatisfied in before that I can believe by a Divine faith, that what the Church propoſeth definitively, is true. A Church cannot be, in the nature of it, expreſſed without a profeſſion of that Religion which directs man to his ſupernaturall end. Now this Religion requires a ſupernaturall revelation, as *Aquinas* diſputes it in the begining of his *Sums*. Then this Religion muſt be revealed, being not naturally intelligible either by principles or works of nature. Where, and how is this Religion revealed? you cannot ſay by the Church, for the queſtion is of the Church. And ſo conſequently

ſequently, how is it revealed that ſuch are of the Church, and aſſiſted by the Holy Ghoſt, or that there is an Holy Ghoſt? Expedite theſe queſtions. And again, conſider, that S. *Auſtin*, and other Fathers have ſpoken freely of diſcerning the Church by Scripture; wherein I am informed what Religion is, what a Church, which the true Church, and that there is a Holy Ghoſt. Again, I muſt believe, by a divine faith, that the Church is the pillar and ground of truth, as you ſay. Well, but how ſhal I come by this divine faith? God infuſeth it, you will ſay; well, but doth he infuſe it immediately, as in reſpect of Scripture? So you muſt ſay; well then, cannot you think that he can infuſe faith of the Scripture immediately in reſpect of the Church? Anſwer me, is this faith wrought in me by the credibility of the Church, or not? if not, how? If ſo, then the Church is naturally διὰμεσος, or the teſtimonie of the Church muſt be reſolved into the teſtimonie of men, *extra rationem Eccleſiæ*, then is it of itſelf but humane. Therefore muſt you come to this, that the Teſtimonie of the Church is infallible by Athoritie of Scripture. Well then, if ſo, then *the Church is not the laſt ground on which we muſt ſtand*. Nor yet is it the firſt ground, as we take it for a Divine ground, which you mean; for it is not Divine but by the word of God: yea, if the Church be the laſt ground on wch we muſt ſtand, then why do you prove the Authority of the Church by the Authority of Scripture? And if you ſay, that you alſo prove the Scripture to be the word of God by the Church; yet not as the laſt ground, but the Church is reſolved into the Authoritie of Scripture as the laſt ground: for if the Church hath no being as ſuch, but by Scripture in the ſubſtance of it, then the Church muſt be ultimately grounded in Scripture; for that which is *primum in generatione* is *ultimum in reſolutione*. So *a primo ad ultimum* the Scripture is the ground of faith.

And ſo this will be contrary to what follows in your laſt, that we do not *firſt believe the Church for the Scripture.* If you ſpeak of a generall motive to believe the Scripture; ſo we may begin with the Church, upon the account of credible men as towards humane faith: but if you ſpeak of belief as Divine, ſo we cannot firſt begin with the Church; becauſe we muſt firſt be aſſured of the Church by the word of God, under the formalitie of Divine faith; the word of God muſt be firſt *in genere credibilium*, unleſſe there were a reſultance of a Church out of naturall principles; which is not to be ſaid.

And in your following words you intimate as much, as if we might firſt admit the Scripture to be the word of God, and then prove *by the Scriptures the authority of the Church.* If we may admit the Scriptures for Gods word firſt, then firſt the Scriptures may be believed to be the word of God without the authority of the Church, which is contrary to what you have ſaid formerly. Then ſecondly, the Scripture muſt be the laſt ground of faith, becauſe, as before, that which is firſt in generation, is laſt in reſolution. And then thirdly. Why do you diſpute with us, concerning the Authority of Scriptures by the Church, ſince we have admitted the Scriptures for the word of God? And therefore ſhould you not urge us to the acknowledgement of Scriptures by the Authoritie of the Church; but wholly to the acknowledgement of the Church by the Authority of the Scriptures.

Paragr. 5. In the fifth Par. you ſay, *you charge me with abating from my firſt propoſition, in which I ſaid, Divine faith in all things was cauſed by the propoſall of the Church, becauſe now I ſay, that when by the infalible Authoritie of the Church, we are aſſured that the Scripture is the word of God, we may believe ſuch things as are clearly contained in Scripture.* Anſ.

Anſ. And I cannot yet bate you an ace of my charge. For your termes are of a believing (indefinitely) upon propoſall of the Church; as if 'twere the immediate, formall cauſe of all faith: and ſo ſeverall of your Arguments would prove, that the Scripture is not at all our rule, but the Church. And this your firſt paper made to be the τὸ κεφάλαιον. and therefore if you had clearly intended the diſpute of this point, whether we are to believe the Scripture to be the word of God, by the Authoritie of the Church; and ſo conſequently, or cauſally, all to be believed for the Church, you ſhould have made this the ſtate of the main queſtion.

But, now you ſay, when by the infalible Authoritie of the Church we are aſſured that the Scripture is the word of God, we may believe ſuch things as are clearly contained in Scripture. And do you not go leſſe now? Do but compare the quantities of your aſſertions, before all things to be believed upon, and for the propoſall of the Church: now, ſome things may be believed for the Scripture, which are plainly contained in it. And the Church and the Scripture are in our caſe oppoſed: ſo then, if firſt all is to be believed by the Authoritie of the Church, and now, ſome things clearly contained may be believed upon Scripture, then do you not onely abate but contradict your ſelf in effect; for, it will come to this, all is to be believed upon the propoſal of the Church; & ſomwhat may be believed not upon the propoſal of the Church, but of Scripture. For, when we are aſſured, you ſay, that the Scripture is the word of God, we may believe ſuch things as are plainly contained in Scripture; then we are to believe it upon the account of the word of God. And your Church can have no higher Authoritie ſurely than God's word for it. Therefore, if you ſay we are to believe what is plainly con-

tained in Scripture (when we are aſſured by the Church, that it is the word of God) for the authoritie of the Church, then I pray tell me why we ſhould believe the Church, if not for the word of God?

Again, to conſider theſe words of yours; if we muſt be aſſured by infalible Authority of the Church that the Scripture is the word of God, before we can believe what is plainly contained therein, then either one of us muſt yeild upon the caſe of the infalibilitie of the Church, or elſe nothing plainly contained in Scripture can be, by your opinion, believed. But you think that ſome things are plainly ſet down in Scripture (though elſewhere, you would conclude as if all things in Scripture were obſcure; and ſo you now alſo abate in this) and herein we both agree: and we think the Church's Authority is not infalible: wherein we differ from you. Now which think you in reaſon ſhould yeild, you, or we? One would think you ſhould yeild rather: ſince we can prove, that whatſoever is contained in Scripture is to be believed without the Authoritie of the Church, and you cannot prove the Authority of the Church to be plainly contained in Scripture; yea, muſt yet believe, upon your principles, the infalible Authority of the Church, before you can believe it, though plainly contained in Scripture; becauſe, you muſt *firſt be aſſured by the infalible Authoritie of the Church, that the Scripture is the word of God, before you do believe, what is contained in Scripture.*

And again, thirdly, we are *aſſured that the Scripture is the word of God*; why may not we then have leave to *believe things plainly contained in Scripture*? *Certa ſunt in paucis*, as *Tertullian* ſaith. We ſay, certain neceſſary truths are not ſo many. Why are not we then well grounded in Religion? ſurely in your account, becauſe we do not go to divine faith, by your infalible

infalible Church. Even as the death of *Remus*, it was ordained by *Romulus*, that whosoever went over the trench at the building of *Rome*, any other than the ordinary way, should be put to death: so, because we do not go the ordinarie Roman way to the building of us in our most holy faith, we must die for ever. As if our faith were not true Divine faith, because it is not implicit by the Church. Which is as much as to say, the obedience of faith is not good, because it is not blind. And this is as much as to say, we do not see, because we do not see. *Jun. 2. An.*

And therefore, fourthly, since, as hath been shewed, the authority of the Church is resolved into Scripture; and since you have confessed, that we may admit the Scriptures to be the word of God, and yet may need to be assured of the Authoritie of the Church, your apologie for your self, in this paragraph, must needs be insufficient.

In the sixth Par. You begin with taking notice of my character of my self to be one of the slender sons of the Church of *England*, *whether so, or whether he hath shewed that Treatise of mine to be no demonstration, Let the indefferent reader, after the due pondering the force of all Arguments, determine.*

Sir, I dare not alter my small opinion of my self. And therefore the consideration of such matters should have dropped from a judicious head into a learned pen. And if your demonstration, as you call it, be indeed such as doth merit the terme, you have proved me to be no better than my word. And if I prove it to be no demonstration, I do not yet falsifie what I said of my self. For I shall impute the cause of it to our cause, the weakest hand may defend our cause: the strongest cannot defend yours.

To passe this, you go on. *Sure I am that this is no Demonstration which you adde, the Scripture is infalible*

*falible, but the Church is not; therefore I muſt take for my ground the Scripture.*

Anſ. But you leave out the ſcope of this Argumentation, and the formalitie of the concluſion. You ſpake of as *clear a Demonſtration as any wiſe man can hope for in this matter.* I told you it was hard to ſay, who does, *optimum quod ſic.* Well, but then I wiſhed you to put it to the teſt; and to try the debate of it by this rule of wiſdome and conſcience, *tene quod certum eſt, relinque quod incertum,* hold that which is certain, leave that which is uncertain; it is certain, that the Scripture is infalible, and you confeſſe it: it is not certain, that the Church is infalible, and I deny it. Which then, ſhould you take to be the rule and ground and cauſe of faith? So I in my laſt. But you leave out all notice of my diſputing this with you, in point of wiſdome, and cut off your own confeſſion; and would have me to make this a Demonſtration, abſolutely in point of truth. You do wiſely to ſhuffle it off, ſince you cannot well bear the dint of it in the way of diſcourſe, *ad hominem.* And yet alſo is it neceſſarily certain, that if our grounds be more certain, then your's are not, becauſe they are contradictorie.

But your making it to be in my account, an abſolute Demonſtration: anſwer, *firſt, the Scripture connot be proved to be the word of God, without the Church be infalible, as I ſhall ſhew ch.* 8. But this was not now the particular queſtion. I diſputed upon your own conceſſion. And therefore this is nothing to my Argument. Apply your anſwers to my proceeding with you upon your account of prudence. And then, ſecondly. Though it be not a Demonſtration, that [*the Scripture is infalible, the Church not, therefore, I muſt take for my ground the Scripture*] yet, it concludes upon advantage: for, though the Church were

were infalible, in the teſtimony of the Scripture, to be the word of God, yet the Scripture were to be the immediate ground of all neceſſary points. Thirdly. Neither doth it contradict my aſſertions, that the Church is not the rule and cauſe of faith, though it were infalible in this Teſtimony; for, if it were infalible in this, yet would it not follow, it ſhould be infalible in all; as I have told you, and you have not anſwered me yet. And then Fourthly. The Scripture may appeare to be the word of God, though the Church be not infalible, as will be ſhewed in anſwer to you.

And therefore all you ſay upon this; *hence followeth, ſecondly, that the Church muſt have infalibilitie ſufficient to ſupport this moſt weightie Article of our faith, that all the Scripture is the word of God: and therefore, upon her Authority I believe the Scripture to be moſt infalible; yet, becauſe I ground this belief upon her Authoritie, her Authoritie is yet the laſt ground of faith.* I ſay, all this hath no ſound diſcourſe, and will come *ad nihil*, even into nothing, upon the two laſt anſwers: firſt becauſe, if from hence I believe the Scriptures to be the word of God; yet, am I not therefore, *ex vi conſequentiæ*, bound to hold the Church the laſt ground of faith in all things; for, it plainly concludes, *a dicto ſecundum quid*. We can hold, that the Generall Councell may be infalible in points neceſſary, though not in all points whatſoever, although you muſt hold infalibilitie in all or none; becauſe you ſay, all is delivered by the Church, upon her Authority equally, without reſpect to the matter. And then ſecondly, upon the laſt anſwer, which was the fourth, we ſhall caſhiere all that is ſaid here; for, that it will appear, that the Scripture is the word of God without the Churches Authoritie for the corroboration of the Title. And ſo there needs not the *infalibilitie ſufficient to ſupport*

*ſupport this moſt weighty Article of faith, that all the Scripture is the word of God.*

Num. 7. *And whereas in your next number, you promiſe ſuch ſouls as have forſaken an infalible Church, an happy eternity, upon this ground, that thoſe things which are neceſſary to Salvation are plain in Scripture; I pray God, their Soules come not to be required at your hands.*

Anſ. I am beholding to my Adverſary for his good wiſhes, that, I may not anſwer for other mens ſouls. But, if he takes here *forſaken* formally, and *an infalible Church* really ſo, (not accounted only to be ſo by him) I deny it, that we have ſo forſaken ſuch a Church, for neither is it infalible ὑπως· and beſides, they have rather forſaken us, and the whole Church, in pretending infalibilitie to themſelves, and Domination over all that will be true Chriſtians. No particular Church can be bound to another, more than as it doth comply with the Catholick Church: now, then if any do leave the Catholick (as the Roman hath done) we cannot join with them, wherein they leave the Catholick, either in point of faith or diſcipline. If we are to give reſpect to a particular Church, as an actuall part of the whole, then, where it ſeparates, we muſt follow the whole. *A turpis eſt omnis pars univerſo ſuo non congruens.* And yet, they firſt made the actuall Schiſm, when the Popes Bull prohibited communion with us.

So then, take *forſaken* rightly, and *an infalible Church* really, we deny the charge. Take them otherwiſe, we denie the conſequence of danger.

But, my Adverſarie would prove our ground to be groundleſs, *firſt, becauſe no Soul can have infalible aſſurance of the Scriptures being the true word of God, if the Church be not infalible, &c.* Whereof you promiſe more. *Num.* 20. 1,2,3,4,5,6,7.

Anſ.

Anſ. This we have had ſo often without proof, that it is to no purpoſe, to ſay any thing to words, for Arguments. *Scaurus negat*; as, *Alphonſus de Caſtro* oppoſeth his adverſary. Yea, alſo you refer me here for proof in the third ch. Your concluſion is here: your proof there; ſo far is your concluſion from proof. Premiſſes were wont to be before the Concluſion, but your opinion is already ſhewed vaine, as touching the ground of your certainty: and your vanity of my opinion I ſhall refute when you ſhew it.

And ſo you ſerve me for the ſecond reſpect, wherein you ſay, my ground is groundleſſe; for, you ſay, *it is manifeſtly falſe, that all things neceſſary to ſalvation are plainly ſet down in Scripture, as you ſhew, ch.3.*

Your concluſion here, that *it is manifeſtly falſe*, &c. I believe will be too large for your Arguments, as it is now too ſoon. We follow your order, as having nothing to do, untill you begin.

In your eighth Par. You ſay, *I find nothing in the next Par. which I have not here anſwered. Onely, you ſtill force me to ſay again, I would have every one to know, that the Roman Church doth oblige to no more, than to believe that the Pope, defining with a lawfull Councell, cannot erre, what proceedeth from this Authority, we profeſſe to proceed from the Authority of the Church. When the Church diffuſed, admitteth theſe definitions, her conſent is yet more apparent.*

You ſay, you find nothing in it, which here you have not anſwered. And what can I finde here, but, that you ſay, *Only you force me to ſay again.* Here is ſome ingenuitie, that you ſeem not to love to ſwell your papers with repetitions. Therefore prove it once: ſay it no more. *Quid verba audiam, facta cum non videam?* But if I might be ſo bold, doth not your term *force* referre to the act *ſay*, not to the Adverb

*again*, as if you had no mind to be put upon expreſſing where the infalibilitie of the Church lies determinately? I ſuppoſe by your words, if you were let alone, you would expreſſe your ſelves in the ſafeſt way confuſely, and in generall, that this infalibilitie is in the Church; whether diffuſed as you ſay, or repreſentative, or virtuall. But it is very wiſely determined by my Antagoniſt, that it is in the Pope, when he defines with a General Councel, that if the Pope be convinced of errour, it may be anſwered, he did not define with a Councell; if a Councel be deprehended of error, it may be ſaid, the Pope did not confirm the decrees of the Councell. And yet the needle doth not ſtand full North; it trembles yet, therefore, *in omnem eventum*, it is ſaid; *when the Church diffuſed admitteth thoſe definitions, her conſent is more apparent.*

May ſome queſtions be aſked here, which may be in anſwer to this? when you ſay (immediately before) *what proceeds from this authority we profeſs to proceed from the Authority of the Church:* Does my Adverſary mean that it proceeds from all the Authority of the Church? The Pope, with a lawful Councel, hath Authority in the Church, and what comes from them, comes from the Authoritie of the Church *objective*; becauſe t his Authority is for the uſe of the Church, and comes from the Authoritie of the Church *ſubjective*, becauſe it comes from them who have Authoritie in the Church. But is the Pope and Councell the adequate ſubject of the Authoritie of the Church? If not, then infalibilitie muſt not be reſted in them, without the conſent of the Diffuſed Church. Secondly, If you meane the Pope and Councell agreeing, as you do, what becomes of the Church as long as they do diſagree, as the fifth Generall Councell and Pope *Vigilius* did? Yea,

Yea, that Councell obtained against the Pope; and is accounted by the Church Universall, in the number of the Generall Councels without the Pope; so that your opinion of the infalibility of the Church, to consist in a Pope defining with a Councel, is not sound, because; if it be infalible, it may be infalible without the Pope; since it hath *vim Consilii* without the Pope; yea, maugre the Pope. Thirdly, If Pope and Councel do consent, what if the diffused Church will not admit these definitions? what then? And I think I have reason to suspect, that such words are here cast out by my Adversary, as may insinuate as much as if the Church diffused might dissent. If they may discent, then they may discent from that which is infalible, or else infalibilitie must also include their consent. If they may not dissent, then what meane those words, *when the Church diffused admitteth these definitions, her consent is yet more apparent?* Me thinks somewhat is intimated here to such a purpose, as if the consent of the Church diffused (besides what is included in the Representative) should formally concurre to the making up of the complement of infalibilitie. So that the Church diffused, should not conduce to these infalible Decrees, by way of object, or as a passive principle, but also actively, by its consent, and this symbolizeth with *Alphonsus de Castro*, and others of your Church, who do settle this infalibilitie in the Acceptation of the Church Universall. And by their opinion, the Church diffused must have a freedome to dissent, or no power.

Par. 9. You say, *as for your complaint, that your paper is not fully answered, I suppose, that if any thing of importance was left unanswered, you will tell me of it here, that I may here answer it.*

Ans. Back reckonings are not wont to be very

pleaſant. But now it ſeems too late to returne an account of my Adverſaries omiſſions, if he was my Adverſary who now is under the reverence of the dead, and the protection of the grave. Otherwiſe I might ſay, there needs not be any particular account in an univerſall Negative. Materially, little is anſwered; and formaly, leſſe. But a Treatiſe was ſent me for an anſwer; yet in ſatisfaction to our own cauſe, and in reſpect to this demand, without diſ-ingenuitie, I ſhall, it may be, now and then note ſome defects. And if any ſhould think that the fight is over when one of the parties is dead; and that *actio moritur cum perſona*, I ſhall onely ſay this, that this is no perſonal quarrel, but reſpects the common cauſe of truth, and yet alſo is it fit that I ſhould returne an anſwer to a reply, as it would be accounted. And when this is done I have done.

And now comes my Adverſarie to a vindication of the manner of anſwering me before. *Concerning my manner of anſwering you, I muſt tell you, that St. Thomas, and the chief School Divines, for claritie and brevitie uſe to proceed thus.* And then he gave me an account of their method, which is ſufficiently known.

To which I anſwer, St. *Thomas* and the Schoolmen do uſe a very good method in the way of their diſcourſe, *pro* and *con*; but our caſe is not the ſame. For my adverſary was not now upon a *problem*, to diſpute upon either part; but upon an oppoſition to that which is defended againſt him. They had not one particular Adverſary againſt whom they were to direct all they ſaid; but my Antagoniſt had. My Antagoniſt ſent me a chalenge, which was faſtned upon me; I anſwered in ſhort: he replyed; I rejoined with an anſwer; and he returned a Treatiſe *in termino*. And therefore this will not ſerve.

How

How doth he apply his poſitive Divinity to my oppoſitive? How is the Treatiſe applied to my diſtinctions? Do his poſitives fall flat againſt my denials? This way the Reader, to be ſure, ſhall know what he ſaies, but not what I ſaid, diſtinctly; becauſe the Treatiſe is not punctually applied to my anſwer. Had *Bellarmin* produced his Adverſaries Arguments no more fully than is done in that Treatiſe, there had not been ſuch need of being ſo carefull, that in all *Italy* (as Sir *Edwin Sandys* notes) we ſhould not finde a *Bellarmin's* Controverſies, for fear any ſhould peruſe them, and not finde his Adverſaries Arguments ſatisfactorily anſwered by him.

Therefore we may have leave to admire thoſe words which come from the Treater, that *your intention in rejoining by a Treatiſe was to have the moſt important matter, diſtinctly, orderly, and fully put down. And by having done ſo, I finde this great commoditie, that your Anſwer becomes more methodicall, and my reply to your Anſwer more clear and perſpicuous, and the Reader ſeeth ſtill how orderly the Combate is.*

I wonder much how this can be ſaid γυμνῇ κεφαλῇ. Could a Reply to my anſwer be more methodicall than in following me κατὰ πόδα, as I followed the opponent? Or could my Anſwer again be more methodicall than in following a Reply, had it been proper and formall and pat? could the moſt important matter in debate betwixt us have been more diſtinctly, orderly and fully put down, than to have ſhewn from place to place, where I had not anſwered directly to the ſtate of the queſtion, or had hit the queſtion, but did not ſufficiently take off the Argument? And could his Reply be by this manner more clear and perſpicuous, when it cannot appeare plainly how he took off my Anſwers, or anſwered

ſwered to the matter or form of my occaſionall Arguments? If this be an orderly Combate, then let us beat the aire, and that will be ſufficient to beat an Adverſary. Thus much of the firſt Chapter; which is no hard Chapter.

## The Anſwer to the ſecond Chapter.

*No neceſſity of a Judge in all Controverſies to whom all ſhould be bound ſimply to ſubmit their aſſent.*

Num. 1. MY Adverſarie ſays here, that I *go about to perſwade* him, that he is *moſt likely to take up* his *Religion by prejudice*

Anſ. It ſeems he is pleaſed to forbeare any Anſwer to my retortion of his ſimilitude, but he takes notice of my returning to him the greater probabilitie of prejudice in point of Religion, to be on their part. And he argues the contrary, becauſe, *being Recuſants, upon this account are liable to loſe two parts of their Eſtates, and what elſe we are, or ſhall be pleaſed to take from them, be it goods, libertie or life.*

Anſ. The prejudice on their part, was as I ſaid, upon the opinion of the infalibilitie of their Church: ſo that I ſpake upon account of a religious *intereſſe*; and he anſwers me upon a civill account rather. This is μετάβασις εἰς ἄλλο γένος. And therefore this anſwer is not pertinent. And whereas he would ſeem to have good ground in Conſcience for his Religion, for which he ſuffers ſo much; if he intends to vye with

with us in that kind, others of our Religion have ſuffered more from them. Surely he forgets the *Marian* days, wherein we dropped more blood than they have done.

And whereas he ſaies to me, --- *and what elſe you are or ſhall be pleaſed to take from us.*

As to this much might be ſaid alſo without paſſion in the ſame kind. No man can take away more from us than our lives, one would think. Yes, *Roman* Catholicks would take away from us Heaven too. They had almoſt deſtroyed me upon earth, ſaith the Pſalmiſt: But theſe will deſtroy us in heaven alſo. Secondly. If he who was mine Adverſary was a Native of *England*, he was as much included in the order of his deprivation as I. Thirdly, I will ſay more yet, that ſome of his Religion have had more favour than we. Yea, yet more than this; one (whom I think he knows well) hath loſt more in proportionall quantity (as *Aquinas* diſtinguiſheth) than any of them hath loſt, who hath loſt but two parts of three, and for Conſcience too. Therefore that character which I gave the Romaniſt, he is to keep ſtill untill he can prove it doth belong more to us. Certainly this is not proved not to belong to them, becauſe they have ſuffered ſo much for their Religion; for we have ſuffered more and therefore it doth not belong to us, but them rather. But this ſuffering *de ſe* is eaſily known not to make an Argument: for unleſſe our cauſe be good before we ſuffer, we have no cauſe to ſuffer at all. The ſaying is common, *Cauſa non paſſio facit Martyrem.* Fourthly. As for the preſent ſufferings of the Papiſts, they are neither rightly charged either upon our Church, or upon our Kingdome; for there is not yet proved any legall conſent of either to what they or others have ſuffered. Nay, fifthly, At the day of Judge-

Judgement we ſhall ſee whether they are not more like to anſwer for what we have ſuffered, than we for what they have ſuffered in theſe times. So that while they do not ſee what is true againſt them, they will ſeem to ſee what is not true againſt us. As *Tertullian* ſaid. But *let us come to the matter.*

To examine then your grounds in the ſecond num.

Num. 2. That *God hath made man to a ſupernaturall end, and to be attained by ſupernaturall meanes,* we grant as *Aquinas* in the begining of of his ſums. Take *men* indefinitely and confuſely, without excluſion of Infants dying before Baptiſme from Salvation poſſible; and thoſe who are not *compotes mentis*; and we grant it.

And alſo that *amongſt* thoſe *meanes, the firſt is true faith*, and that *according to his mercifull providence he hath provided us ſome way to this faith ſo eaſie, that all, if they pleaſed, might be brought to the knowledge of it*; namely, *exceptis excipiendis.* And that the *greater part of men are ignorant*; yea, all naturally ignorant of the way to this ſupernaturall end, as *Aquinas*, becauſe it is ſupernaturall; theſe things we yield to you. And that *becauſe the far greater part were ignorant, it beſeemed his goodneſſe (who is the lover of ſoules) to provide us ſuch a way as that ignorant men ſhould not be able (unleſſe by wilful careleſneſſe) to erre by it.*

Theſe things we do willingly yield. But we demurre upon your aſſumption, that this way ſhould be the Church, as you interpret that of *Iſaiah* the 35, where you ſay, the Prophet ſpeakes of a *path and a way which ſhall be ſo direct that fools cannot erre by it.* Here we muſt ſtand a while and inquire what is the ſenſe of this way.

And firſt I muſt note that you do not rightly render

der the words according to the Hebrew veritie. You ſay, *and it ſhall be unto you a direct way, ſo that fools cannot erre.* But it is not ſo in the text. But thus. [He ſhall be to them or with them walking the way, and fools ſhall not erre.] How is your Church like to be this way, when either you erre in not following it, or it doth erre in not right following the text. And you make it to be in the text *a direct way*, and ſo *that fools cannot erre.* Whereas it is rather [ſhall not erre,] which doth note ſo much infalibilitie as preſervation from error. Now a negative of the act doth not prove a negative of the power; for then the Argument would be good, *a non eſſe ad non poſſe.* Therefore could my Adverſary have proved, that the Church of *Rome* never erred, (which will never be proved) yet all is not yet whole; becauſe infalibilitie is not yet proved by the not erring, but by an impoſſibilitie of erring. And if you may erre *by careleſneſſe*, as before, then when were any ſure of being right; for who can be ſure he hath been as carefull as he ſhould be? and therefore if this be the condition of not being deceived, yea, of infalibilitie, it is at leaſt morally impoſſible, that any ſhould be aſſured in their faith; becauſe they may be wanting in their diligence; and ſo alſo may demerit a deprivation of Divine light.

My Adverſary goes on. *To elude this text you ſay, ſure we may be, that the letter doth reſpect the Jewiſh Church after their redemption from Captivitie.* Anſ. And I ſee no reaſon to the contrary, if we conſider ſeveral expreſſions in that place, which carry that ſcope; and alſo if we conſider, that ordinarily at leaſt when any thing is prophecied myſtically of the Church Chriſtian in the old Inſtrument, it is yet true in the letter of the Jews. And alſo thirdly, If we will take notice of the Septuagint, who render it,

οἱ δὲ διασπαρέντες παρέσονται ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ οὐ μὴ πλανηθῶσι. Thoſe that are diſperſed ſhall walke amongſt them and not erre. And if you take this verſion to be the Septuagints, you may know they knew the text as well as the Latine Church.

Therefore this you would ſuppoſe and argue upon it. *If he did direct the Jewiſh Church by a way ſo direct, that fools could not erre by it, there can be no good reaſon why he ſhould be leſſe carefull to direct the ignorant of the Church of Chriſt.*

Anſ. My Adverſary did not conſider, that if it be underſtood of the Jewiſh Nation, it is not preſently to be underſtood of the Jewiſh Church under that formality. It may be intended of them in the civill ſenſe, and not in their Eccleſiaſticall reſpect: and then we cannot argue from a temporall promiſe made to the Jew, to a Spirituall promiſe made to the Chriſtian; though men are bold to make ſuch accommodations. For then might we, of our own power, make a myſtical ſenſe of Scripture, wherein one thing ſhould by Divine intention ſignifie another thing, this we cannot do; for then myſticall Divinitie ſhould be Argumentative, which is denied even by the Pontificians.

Yet he goes on. *Yet I thinke it is ſure that this is not the true Interpretation. For when did the blinde ſee, the deaf hear, when did then God come himſelf and ſave us?* Anſ. It may be underſtood in the letter, and yet ſome expreſſions be hyperbolical; Yea, thoſe expreſſions may be underſtood in the letter without any hyperbolicalneſſe; as that thoſe who never thought to ſee or heare of ſuch a Redemption actual, ſhould ſee and heare of it, ſhould not onely heare of it, but ſee it. Secondly, When do we heare of vengance and recompence ſpoken of, ver 4. And drie ground and pools and habitation of Dragons

gons and a place for reeds and rushes, spoken of, ver. the 7. to be in the Church Christian in a spirituall sense? Put one to the other: and which of them hath more moment? And to the other question, *when did then God come himself and save us?* We answer, this makes no Scruple of such an Interpretation of it to the Jew; neither because it is said *he will come*, nor because it is said *he will save*. Not the first nor the second, for the first is as ordinarie, as the terme *save* is usuall in the old Instrument for the temporall sense. Wherefore had *Joshua* his name from the same root? was he to be a spirituall Saviour? It is true he was typicall of Christ Jesus, but he was typicall by a temporal deliverance, yea, even the Greek word is sometimes used for a temporall salvation, in the new *Testament*, as *Mat.* 8. 25. κύριε σῶσον ἡμᾶς, Master save us, we perish, yea, the word Σωτὴρ, which commonly is rendered Saviour, when applied to Christ, is sometimes applied to God in the new *Testament* in a temporall sense, as is noted rationally by some Criticks; and particularly in that text some give an instance thereof. 1 Epi. to *Tim.* 4. 10. Who is the Saviour of all, σωτὴρ, especially of those that believe. He is the Saviour of all in a temporall sense, specially of those who believe. And thus *Estius* upon the text would carrie it, for which exposition he names *Chrysostom*, *Oecumenius*, *Ambrosiaster*, *Anselme*. And he said positively, *constat autem ex aliis Scripturæ locis, &c.* it is manifest also out of other places of Scripture, that the term of salvation is understood of the good things of the temporall life. So he upon the place.

He proceeds, *And if you will have our Saviour himself to be this way, as he said, I am the truth and the way; this self same Saviour said, I (who am this way) am with you to the consummation of the world;*

*to wit, directing my Church the right way to Salvation: of which direction the Church now hath no leſſe need than then.* Anſ. He ſuppoſeth that which is not granted, nor yet doth he go about to prove it, that it is to be underſtood by Divine intention of the Chriſtian Church *objective*, This is not to be allowed, unleſſe myſticall Divinity were in the nature of it argumentative. And my ſecond anſwer to this text, wherein I referred it to the time of Chriſt in way of ſuppoſition, (if it were at all to be referred to the time of the Chriſtian Church according to *Iſider*, *Clarius* and St. *Jerom.*) he cannot well deny; but will argue from it, that the *Church hath no leſſe need of direction now than then.* Anſ. This Reply hath no ſtrength of reaſon in it, for the foundation of Chriſtianitie was then to be layd; which foundation perſonall was Chriſt, then it was to be built upon the foundation miniſteriall, the Apoſtles alſo, as St. *Paul* ſpeakes, *Eph.* 2. 20. The new Teſtament was not then written, the propagation of the Goſpell was not then made, Chriſtian Doctrine was not univerſally received. And therefore then was there more need of infalible direction by Chriſt and his Apoſtles than now. And this really anſwereth your ſuppoſition, that ſuch an infalible direction which by our Saviour was promiſed to the Church by the Apoſtles ſhould alwaies continue in the Church; whereas it is not ſo neceſſary by neceſſitie of meane or end. And therefore, can we not make a demonſtration of it *a cauſa finali*, becauſe it is not neceſſary for the end of Salvation. *Deus nec deficit in neceſſariis, nec abundat in ſuperfluis*, as he ſaid: he is neither wanting in neceſſaries, nor is abundant in ſuperfluities.

But this paſſage muſt be made good by them, or all is loſt; therefore he goes on. *And as we could not*

*not ſecurely have put a limitation to thoſe words of Joel* (namely, concerning the powring out of the ſpirit) *if St. Peter had not ſecured us of the true ſenſe: ſo cannot you limit theſe words, not having the like warrant for it.* Anſ. So then firſt, Are thoſe words of *Joel* limited? Yes, he confeſſeth it, and it is ſo plain by St. *Peter* in the ſecond of the *Acts*, that it cannot be denied. Upon this confeſſion we diſpute. If thoſe words of St. *Peter* be limited, then alſo the other text [*Mat.* 28. laſt. I am with you to the end of the world] is alſo limited. The conſequence is, it may be, demanded. It is given thus. If the gifts of the Holy Ghoſt are not now to be expected as then, then can we not now pretend infalibilitie as then, becauſe this is a ſpeciall gift of the Holy Ghoſt. Therefore have we no ſuch need of an infalible limitation of that text by ſome other paſſages of Scripture; for *interpretative*, as we may ſpeak, it is here done by St. *Peter* in a text of the ſame kind; ſo that although it doth not follow, that becauſe one text is limited by Scripture, therefore we may limit another text; yet if the text in queſtion be of the ſame kind, we do not limit it, but ſhew, that it is conſequently limited. For ſecondly, All other extroardinary diſpenſations of the Holy Ghoſt are terminated in the event: no more Apoſtles, no more Prophets, no more Evangeliſts, no more gift of tongues; and why then ſhould the gift of infalibilitie be held up? And why had not thoſe (whom ſome of yours have ſpoke of) who were ſent to preach the Goſpell to the Heathens, the gift of tongues miraculouſly beſtowed upon them, which might have been an argument and credit to their infalible Doctrine?

Yet he would continue power of miracles too: to this purpoſe he urgeth the text, *thoſe that believe ſhall do greater works than theſe. John.* 14. 12.

*Anſ*

*Anſ.* The ſubject of that propoſition [*thoſe that believe*] is conſiderable in the ſuppoſition, and in the oppoſition. In the ſuppoſition it is to be conſidered, how many it extends to; in the oppoſition, to what ſort of men, whether Clergy or Laitie: conſider it in the ſuppoſition, and we ſay, If it be extended to the preſent Church, we denie it: If it be not extended, it concludes nothing. Conſider it in the oppoſition, as to what ſort of men it belongs; then, if you take it incluſively to the Laitie, then by your Argument, infalibility ſhould be in them. For ſo your diſcourſe muſt run, thoſe that do greater miracles than Chriſt, they may be infalible: then I aſſume, If you take it incluſively of the Laitie, the Laitie may do greater works than Chriſt, then they are infalible. And then how, or why do you ſtate infalibilitie in the Pope and a Councel, which are two things that do not eaſily come together? And ſo the ſubject of the propoſition muſt be taken, for it bears no reſpect to holy Orders, *ſecundum rationem ſpecialem*; it is ſaid, *thoſe that believe*, not thoſe of the Clergie which believe. So it hath it ſelfe indifferently to all ſorts of men that do believe: and if my Adverſary tooke it as of the Clergie, let me pay him in his own coin, in telling him, we may not limit it without *a warrant*; ſince, if all their Clergie did work miracles; yet all that do work miracles are not Clergie men.

Secondly, The Text is not ingenuouſly applied; for, it ſhould not be applied to miracles, as he doth; but to workes, μείζονα there refers to ἔργα. Now all works are not miracles, though all miracles are ſaid to be works. All Chriſt's works were not miracles: and Chriſt did not alwaies at all times work miracles. And therefore doth your *Ferus* upon the place note, that it is not ſaid, *ſemper & omni loco ſigna faciet*, he

he ſhall alwaies and in all places do ſignes, nay, upon the ſame place, whereas ſome underſtand it of ſigns, he ſaies, this were hard, that no man ſhould be a Believer, but he ſhould do ſigns, *quandoquidem nullus noſtrum hoc tempore ſignum facit.* Therefore he ſaith, ſome underſtand it not of workes of miracles, but of works of virtues.

And therefore the following words needed not to have beene added, *If then this text was verified after our Saviours time, you cannot ſay it is onely ſpoken of his time, and that he did take away a way ſo neceſſary for us, his gifts being without repentance.*

*Anſ.* This is nothing to the purpoſe, though we grant, it did continue ſometime after Chriſt, unleſs it be drawn down to the times of the preſent Church it is inconſequent to your uſe: Yea, thoſe words of Chriſt [*I am with you unto the end of the world,*] may be verified without any infalibilitie in the Church reſident in men; much more without infalibilitie in a particular Church: It is a plaine falacie of conſequent, his being with them infalibly is a way of being with them; therefore every way of being with them is a way of infalibilitie. And this is ſufficient to deſtroy the hopes which the *Pontificians* have of this Text. Beſides that, if infalibilitie were by this Text continually promiſed to the Church univerſal, the *Romaniſt* cannot come in for any more than a part; for this is ſaid by Chriſt, and at his aſcenſion too to all the Apoſtles *in communi*; and therefore from this Text they can chalenge no priviledge of ſucceſſion to S. *Peter.* or Vicariate to Chriſt, becauſe this is ſpoken to them all, which is alſo expreſſed in the Syriack. So that your diſcourſe hereupon goes upon a double errour in the Rule thereof: firſt, becauſe you argue *a genere ad ſpeciem affirmative:*

*affirmative*, for thus you muſt reaſon, he will be with them to the end of the world, therefore as he was with the Apoſtles, infalibly. Secondly, Becauſe you argue *a totout ſic ad partem*; becauſe he will be with the Church univerſall, therefore with you who are but a part. And alſo, what if the Apoſtles did greater miracles than Chriſt? what is this to your purpoſe? Or if other believers ſhould afterwards do greater miracles, your Repreſentative Church would be leſſe neceſſary, for they that could work miracles would not need your infalible direction. Or if they did, then cannot you conclude from ſuppoſed continuance of miracles, continuance of infalibility.

Put then your reaſon into a forme and it will be an *Enthymem, his gifts are without repentance*, therefore *he hath not taken away a way ſo neceſſary*: and what then? There might have been taken away a way ſo neceſſary to ſhew Sophiſtry. To the antecedent therefore we ſay, there is an equivocation in the word *gifts*. The word ſometimes ſignifies grace of gifts, ſometimes gifts of grace. If you take it here of the former, it were more pertinent to your ſcope; but ſo it is not true to the text. If of the latter, it is true to the meaning of the place; but 'tis not pertinent to your purpoſe: and becauſe he knew the text [*Rom.* 11. 29.] not to be underſtood of the grace of gifts; wiſely is there left out that which might hinder ſuch appearance, namely, *the calling*, for ſo it runs, the gifts and calling of God are without repentance.

And that which follows in his reply is alſo captious. For he did not finde in my words, that I applied the text to the Jews in the ſpirituall kind, as of infalibility, and therefore he ought not to thinke it ſtrange, that this *gift ſhould not in full dimenſions*

*be*

*be always extended to the Church*: unleſſe we might from the litterall ſenſe to the Jew conclude a myſticall, to the Chriſtian proportionably to the letter; which cannot rationally be done.

He goes on. *I cannot believe you truſt your other Argument, if this way be promiſed to the Church*, ergo, *the Church is not this way. Suppoſe God had promiſed the Kingdome of France a Monarchy*: Ergo, *the Kingdome of France (ſay you) is no Monarchy. The true conſequence is, the Kingdome of France is this Monarchy. Anſ.* I am not diſpleaſed with mine own Argument, if there can be no more ſaid againſt it than is here. I know no difference betwixt a King and a Monarch ſufficient to ground a diſtinction, and in the new *Teſtament* the greek word which ſignifies a King is uſually applied to the expreſſing of Emperors. And therefore if God had promiſed the Kingdom of *France* a Monarchy, he ſhould have promiſed it it ſelf. And ſo if God had promiſed the Church to be this way, he ſhould have promiſed it it ſelf. I had thought, that as the object of the thing in humane ſpeculation is before the act ſpeculative; ſo the object of perſon had been conſidered before acts practick, otherwiſe the object of the perſon and the object of the thing do not differ. Thus, if the promiſe of this way to the Church, be the promiſe of the Church its being this way, then the *terminus rei* and the *terminus perſonæ* is all one. Therefore muſt this way be diſtinguiſhed from the Church: otherwiſe the Church hath nothing promiſed. And how can this way be predicated of the Church in ſuch a propoſition [the Church is this way] when according to your principles, the Church muſt have its exiſtence by this way, before it can be this way. And ſo muſt have its being before its cauſe, which amounts to a contradiction, that it ſhould be and not be; for it muſt be before it is. Yea; if the Church is to be ſuppoſed before it be the

way, and yet is to have its conſiſtence by this way, this is to make that which is to be, which alſo makes that which is not to be, becauſe it muſt not be before it be.

Yet he goes on. *The Church is this way which God promiſed it ſhould be.* But to whom did he promiſe it? To ſingulars before they are aggregated in the unity of a Church? Then the ſingulars yet muſt be a Church before they be a Church, becauſe this way was promiſed, you ſay, to the Church. If the diffuſed Church be the object of the promiſe to whom it is made; then again, how were the Chriſtians without faith? Or how had they faith without a Repreſentative, which is the way promiſed, as he ſuppoſeth?

Yet again, *and it is ſo by the ſure guidance of him who is the way, and is with his Church ruling it until the conſummation of the world. And ſo Chriſt is* regula regulans, *and the Church* regula regulata.

So then at length my Adverſary is come to my diſtinction; onely, he will not apply it as I did. I ſaid the Scripture is *regula regulans*, the Church is *regula regulata*: he ſaies now, that Chriſt is *regula regulans*, the Church is *regula regulata*. So that in part he is come over to us, in that he ſays, the Church is the rule ruled: and he or any other could hardly overcome us in the other, that Chriſt ſhould be the rule ruling, and not by the Scripture. Chriſt doth not now rule us immediately, but by the Spirit; and therefore is he ſaid to be the Spirit of Chriſt. neither doth the Spirit rule us immediately, but by the word which the Spirit of Chriſt did inſpire the Pen-men of Scripture in to this purpoſe. So it remains, that the Scripture is the word of Chriſt by his Spirit. And by this word which was firſt delivered by his Spirit is Chriſt the way. He is the way of merit

merit by his death. He is the way of example by his life. He is the way of precept and direction by his word. If he divides the word from the Spirit he makes it not the word of God: if he divides the Spirit from the word, ſo that the Spirit ſhould direct beſide the word, he runs into Enthuſiaſmes. The Spirit hath it ſelfe to the word as the Dictator; the Apoſtles have themſelves and the Prophets to the word as the Pen-men. The word hath it ſelf to us as the rule, which from God through Chriſt by his Spirit in the Pen-men of Scripture is to direct us unto our Supernaturall end. Therefore ſaith St. *Paul*, let the word of Chriſt dwell in you richly in all wiſedome, *Coloſ.* 3. 16. To conclude then this Anſwer, ſince Chriſt is now confeſſed to be the rule ruling, he is the rule ruling, either by his Church or by his word. If by his Church, as my Adverſary, how is this Church to be ruled, ſince this is the rule ruled? By his Spirit they will ſay; well, but how? In a Councell, they will ſay, confirmed by the Pope. But for the firſt three hundred yeares their was no Councill; nor Pope in their ſence, for more. How then? Then by his Spirit, cauſally, in the word; according to which the Arch-Biſhop of *Collen* reſolved to reform his Church: for which he was cited before the Emperour: and excomunicated afterwards by the Pope, in the yeare 1546.

But, *being ruled by him there is not the leaſt danger that it will ſwerve from the word of God, and you may well follow ſuch a Guide with blinde obedience.*

So my Antagoniſt goes on upon the Church. *Anſ.* To this paſſage much may be ſaid. Firſt, that the former words are wiſely put together: *ſi non ceſſe, tamen caute.* For there is a reſerve of ſenſe in which they are true; namely, *in ſenſu compoſito*, whilſt it is ruled by Chriſt, there is not the leaſt dan-

ger of ſwerving from the word of God, but it is yet to be proved, that it will always be ruled by Chriſt. Make this ſure and we have done. But if it had always been ruled by Chriſt, it would not have violated his inſtitution of Communion under both kinds. Put this then into a forme of diſcourſe: that which is ruled by Chriſt doth not ſwerve from his word; the Church of *Rome* is ruled by Chriſt therefore: and we limit the major, ſo far as it is ruled by Chriſt it doth not ſwerve from the word; it is not true, that it never ſwerves, unleſſe it be true, that it is always ruled by Chriſt; but then we deny the Aſſumption, for it is not always ruled by Chriſt. 2. We note here, that the rule Chriſt rules us by, is his word, for ſo it is ſaid here, *being ruled by Chriſt it will not ſwerve from his word.* So then by his own words, Chriſt's adequate rule is his word; otherwiſe we might be ruled by him and yet ſwerve from his word. And alſo conſequently if we follow his word, we follow him. And thoſe that do not follow his word do not follow him. Thirdly, we muſt differ with him upon the point of *blinde obedience*, therefore whereas he ſaies *you may well follow ſuch a Guide with blind obedience*, we ſay abſolutely, blind obedience is not rationall, it is not λογικὴ λατρεία in any ſenſe, and then we ſay again, this obedience he ſpeaks of, would be rational obedience; and therefore not blind. For, to follow ſuch a Guide which is always ruled by Chriſt, and therefore never ſwerves from his word (if this can be made good to me, that any Church doth, and cannot do other) is very rationall and not blind obedience. If the ſaying and definition of the Church be aſſured by Chriſt and his word, to be according to Chriſt and his word, it is neceſſary to be obedient to it, as to what I finde in Scripure; though I do not comprehend the reaſon of it, as the Scripture doth bind to faith without

out dispute: so would the Church, were I assured by the Scripture, that the Church could not swerve from it. But here are two things wanting; one is of a proof, that the Church hath not swerved. And a second, that it cannot swerve from the word of God. For my faith must build it self immediately not upon the former; because the power of swerving is not sufficiently secured by the negative; but it must be built upon the impossibilitie, and this should be demonstrated.

*And still I must mind you, that I speake of the Universall Church convented in a Generall Councell confirmed by the Supreme Pastor.*

*Ans.* And I still say, that the Universall Church so constituted, is not free from the least danger of swerving from the word of God. And this in grosse were enough, until it were made good by sound Argument. Yet also particularly. First, he meanes the Universall Church representatively; (for otherwise, all cannot come together) but then let us have an account why there could not be admitted to the titles of the *Trent* Councell, that which the French so much urged, namely [representing the Universall Church?] If it did represent the Universal Church, why might it not be said in the title? If it did not, how does he say *the Universall Church convented in a General Councell?* 2. A Supreme Pastor in your sense should be proved and not supposed. For we acknowledge no Supreme Pastor but Christ, wch can give life or law to all the Church. He the Pastor and Bishop of our souls. 1 *Pet.* 2. 25. He the chief Pastor. 1 *Pet.* 5. 4. And all Bishops under him do equally participate a Vicarial care of the Church. But thirdly, the *Trent* Council, according to you, was general and confirmed by the Supreme Pastor; and *Vigilius* was the Tutilarie Saint of the valley of Trent; and yet the Trent Councell swer-

ſwerved groſſely from the word of God, and particularly in the matter of half communion; as in the twentie firſt ſeſſion, notwithſtanding Chriſt his inſtitution and the ſeverall interpretations of the Doctors and Fathers acknowledged againſt them in the firſt chap. of that ſeſſion; and although from the begining of Chriſtian Religion the uſe under both kinds was not unfrequent, as is confeſſed in the ſecond ch. Fourthly, if the Church ſo conſtituted cannot ſwerve from the word of God, why did the Trent Councell feare to determine what is the nature of original ſin, which *Vigo* urged them to, upon good reaſons? And why did they not determine whether the bleſſed Virgin was exempted from original infection, whereof the *Franciſcans* ſo much urged the affirmative to be defined; the *Dominicans* the negative? And yet in ſaying, *non eſſe ſuæ intentionis*, it was not of their intention to comprehend in this Decree, wherein original ſin is handled, the bleſſed and immaculate Virgine, they do interpretatively exempt her, though St. *Paul* and all holy Doctors did not exempt her, as the *Dominicans* urged; and ſo they do in effect contradict their univerſal propoſition, wherein it is ſaid, *Propagatione non imitatione tranſfuſum omnibus*: at leaſt it makes that definition uncertain, as the German Proteſtants noted.

Therefore that which followes in his Paper doth not follow in reaſon: *This Church, guiding by her infalible Doctrine, is this way, the Church diffuſive (guided now by this doctrine) was promiſed this direct way. Such a way we were promiſed; a way ſo direct repreſented, that fools cannot erre by it.*

*Anſ.* Theſe words might have been all ſpared, for they are all as Ciphers till one thing be proved, and that is, the infalible Doctrine as a property inſeparable

rable to the Church. If the Church goes this way to prove her ſelfe the way, ſhe is not the way, becauſe ſhe goes out of the way, or elſe Chriſt was out of the way, and the Primitive Church was not the Church; when for ſo many yeares it is confeſſed, that there was no General Councill; and is not proved that there was a Pope in their ſence, as indeed there was none. So then the Church univerſal is not the way univerſally, *ſo direct that fools cannot erre*: for, in all times there was not the univerſall Church ſo repreſented; nor the Decrees of the repreſented Church ſo confirmed; becauſe there was no Pope. And therefore if yet the Church had another way then; we have more reaſon to go that way than the way which leads to *Rome*; and from *Rome* we know not whither but to darkneſſe: and thoſe that follow this way are not wiſer by following it; for, they are not wiſe in following it. Ἀμφότερα γ καλὰ· καὶ τὸ εἰδέναι ὅτι οὐκ ἴσμεν, καὶ τὸ γνῶναι ἃ οὐκ ἴσμεν, as *Hierocles* ſaid well. Both theſe things are good, to know that we do not know, and to know what we do not know. And ſurely, if we ſhould go their blinde way, we ſhould neither know what wiſe men know, nor know neither that we are ignorant. Therefore *Catarinus* and *Marinarus* took another way to aſſert certainty of Grace, namely, by Scripture; as we have it in the Hiſtory of the *Trent* Council, wherein they ſhaked the Adverſaries of the opinion, and brought them to ſome moderation.

And this example of theirs in following the Scriptures might (if we were doubtfull of our cauſe) yet incourage us to give check to that which follows. *The Scripture, as ſome may conceive, (for you dare not defend it) is not this way.*

*Anſ.* All conceive that it is the way but your Church. Yea, all your Church are not for this.

Church

Church way. Beſides thoſe named the Arch-Biſhops of *Collen*, *Catarinus*, *Marinarus*, how many even in the face of the Trent Councell have urged Scripture againſt all other Arguments. The antient Fathers made the Scripture their way and rule, and therefore their authorities are not anſwered to by my Antagoniſt; for that they are unanſwerable. Therefore we *dare*, and do *defend it*; for it will defend us in the doing of it. But this Campian bragged of our diffidence. We return as he did who was to be put to death, as *Tacitus* relates it, when the Executioner bad him beare it bravely; he replied, *Utinam tu tam fortiter feries*. So I would my Adverſary had as ſtrongly oppoſed, as we are in hope to anſwer. But it were better for them to have either leſſe confidence, or to add more ſtrength. As *Archidamus* ſaid to his ſon after an unſucceſſe, Ἡ τῇ δωσέμεν πείθεις ἢ τὸ φρονήματος ὕφες. So let them give ſtronger Arguments, or quit the cauſe.

Let us ſee his reaſon. *For we ſee with our eyes, not onely fools, but alſo moſt learned men to erre groſſely, and to follow moſt contradictorie opinions, whilſt they profeſſe from their hearts to follow Scripture as near as they can.*

*Anſ.* This is λόγος ἄλογος. Firſt, becauſe men do erre, therefore is not that the way? The errour is by them, becauſe they go from the way: not by the way, becauſe they go in it. It concludes as much, as if the way to *Rome* were not the way, becauſe, ſome men do not finde it. Secondly, they *profeſſe from their hearts*, as they ſay, to *follow Scripture as near as they can*: but do they from their hearts profeſſe it? Thirdly, if *moſt learned men do erre groſſely and follow moſt contradictorie opinions, &c.* it ſeems then ſome moſt learned men think this is the way. Fourthly, if they follow moſt contradictorie opinions and

and yet follow Scripture, the fault muſt be in them; for you dare not ſay there is any contradiction in Scripture. Fifthly, they may be in way of Salvation, though ſome do erre in the ſenſe of Scripture, as it is drawn down in application to ſome points of queſtion. Sixthly, there ſhould have been conſidered here a poſſibilitie of recrimination with more advantage againſt the Adverſary. For how many of them do erre in following the Church, and are more prone to erre, becauſe the Church is more variable, and their traditions (which, they ſay, are part of the rule) are not written? In particular, how many of them paſſionately differ from one another about the ſubject of Eccleſiaſtick power, about temporall power, whether the Pope hath any? then whether direct or indirect? How many of them hotly maintained contrary opinions in the Council of Trent? And yet I hope they followed the Church. For if they held Scripture the rule, they were Adverſaries to my Adverſary. Seventhly. Therefore ſince men may finde your way, and yet erre by it; and not finde Scripture and yet erre by it (for the Church may, for ought is proved, teach errour, the Scripture not) let *fools* go that way, and *moſt learned men* goe the way of Scripture. My Argument then is yet good. That way which the Church goes we muſt go. And this they will not deny. But the Church goes the way of Scripture, and this they cannot deny. Nor is there any direct Anſwer made thereunto. Therefore,

Neither is my fourth Anſwer anſwered. Therefore may we conclude contradictorily to his concluſion of this number, *the viſible Church* is not this *Judge, by ſubmiſſion to the judgement* whereof *we are ſecured* from all errour.

Num. 3. S. 2. *Whence what you ſay againſt my third Number is eaſily anſwered. For all Religions agreeing, that there muſt be one Judge of all controverſies, which either be or may be in Religion, they muſt all give infallibilitie to their Judge.*

*Anſ.* And from what was ſaid before, all that you reply to my anſwer is eaſily anſwered, for no Religion but yours doth ſay, that there muſt be a formall, viſible Judge of all controverſies, infallible. And as for us, we ſay, there is no need of ſuch a Judge: and our principles do conclude negatively to ſuch a Judge. For whereas we ſay, *God's written word hath plainly ſet down all things neceſſary to ſalvation*, as you do relate it, we alſo by conſequence inferre, that there is no need of controverſie in things neceſſary, becauſe, the Scripture hath plainly determined thoſe points which are neceſſary, already, which how true it is we ſhall ſhew in anſwer to *your third Chapter.*

*All other Sectaries agreeing with you in that point, I underſtand not how you could ſay, that none but we hold an infallible Judge.*

*Anſ.* If you include us here amongſt the Sectaries, as you ſeem to do, we deny the charge. And we ſay, we are no more Sectaries than the Catholick was before Papacie had head or foot in the world. We ſay, as he, my name is Chriſtian; my ſir-name is Catholick. We have made no ſuch change of Doctrine, as to be accounted Hereticks, as you call us; nor of Diſcipline, as to be accounted Schiſmaticks: but we ſhould not appear ſo innocent, unleſſe Romans ſhould firſt accuſe us. And ſecondly, there are no Sectaries but you that do maintain the contrary: unleſſe they be Anabaptiſts and Enthuſiaſts, which make themſelves infallible Judges, as your ſingle Church makes it ſelf an infallible Judge. For, Third-

ly,

ly, those who hold the Scripture to set down plainly all things necessary, are not in this Sectaries, as seems to be intimated in the former words. Nor, fourthly, by holding the Scripture to have plainly set down things necessary, do they inferre, that there is a necessity of an infallible Judge to decide all controversies which may spring up; For their opinion includes the contrary. And therefore upon the whole matter, the former words are not so rationally delivered.

And what he saies afterwards, that *without an infallible Guide every man might proceed, as if your faith were fallible, and so give an infallible assent to nothing*, is indeed *gratis dictum*. For if this discourse be resolved, as it must be, into this proposition, Without an infallible Guide, our faith is fallible, and we can give infallible assent to nothing, it will appear to be false, because the proposition is false, as it is taken universally. For though in points of question I cannot give an assent infallibly to a Judge, unless I do give an assent infallible to this Judge's being infallible; yet we hope, we may give an infallible assent to those things which are plain in Scripture, and not questioned. Yea, secondly, I may give an infallible assent to that which is in question, without an infallible Judge external; because, by his agitation of it, I may see it plainly resolved into the sense of Scripture: which indeed is the formall rationall end of all Councils, that by the conference of learned men the meaning of Scripture as to the case may be cleared. The former discourse therefore is plainly fallacious, *a dicto secundum quid*, or *a particulari*; as if because we cannot have an infallible faith of things disputed without an infallible Judge, we could have no faith in any thing but fallible. Yea, it is false in those particulars debated; for we may

have a faith infallible of them by Scripture, though the Judge miniſteriall be not infallible. The faith *objective* is infallible in the Scripture, and the faith may be infallible *ſubjective*, by the rule of Scripture, and yet the Judge fallible, becauſe we may make uſe of the Fathers of the Church as Conſuls, not as Dictators.

In the next words he would vindicate himſelf from ſaying, that *without ſuch a Judge we ſhould be free to follow (without any fault) our private Judgement, in holding what we will, as you inſinuate. But I ſaid otherwiſe, every man might be free to believe what he judged beſt; and ſo we ſhould have as many Religions as there be private, and different judgements, &c.*

*Anſ.* He doth me wrong in ſaying, that I *put* in *ſuch words* as I *knew how to anſwer*, and leaved out his *true words*: I altered no words, but expounded him in them, as I had reaſon. For if every one might be left free (without ſuch a Judge) to what he judged beſt, this freedome would be ſimple or morall. If ſimple, then it would be without a fault: and if morall, it would be without a fault; but now he denies that he meant a morall freedome. Yet is it beſt for him to underſtand ſuch a freedome, according to his principles: for if we have not a morall freedome (without a fault) to believe what we judge beſt, then have we leſſe reaſon of giving undiſputed aſſent to an externall Judge, ſince we are awed and commanded, under peril of a fault, to take heed what we do believe. And therefore cannot we believe this Judge with blind obedience, becauſe it ſeems now, we may not believe what we will, but we muſt ſee good reaſon for what we do believe: And good reaſon it is, that good reaſon ſhould exclude blind obedience. And indeed his conſequence is

is falſe *in terminis*, for we have not a ſimple freedome to believe what we will, as I ſaid; becauſe the underſtanding naturally aſſents to truth apparent. But this he takes no notice of, as if I had ſaid no ſuch thing. How much of my words he takes away privatively, which muſt inferre a variation of my ſenſe, may be gathered by compare of my copy with his reherſall: and it appears, that negatively he hath taken away a great part of my words; for he ſaies to them *idem*. And ſo his argument is null: and his vindication nullified. Onely I muſt alſo note, that he did not well weigh his own conſequence [if every man were left free to hold what he judged beſt, *we ſhould have as many Religions as private judgements*] for in principles of Religion we are not like to differ, if we believe the Scripture: and particular Controverſies (which you direct your diſcourſe to, if you ſpeak *ad idem*; if not, you are more to be blamed) do not make different Religions; becauſe then you muſt have different Religions amongſt your ſelves.

In the begining of this number my Adverſary would faine take me tripping or enterfearing upon my own words by a conſequence: becauſe (as he thinks) I take away all meanes of regulating our judgement, and yet ſay, *we ſhould not follow our own judgement of diſcretion, without meanes of regulating our judgement.* Num. 4.

*Anſ.* His reaſon may well be put into this forme; he that taketh away all infallible means, takes away all means able to produce an infallible aſſent: but I *take away all infallible means.* Then I deny his aſſumption. I do not deny all infallible meanes. I do not deny all meanes, becauſe I deny ſome to be infallible, and I do not deny all infallible means, becauſe I deny ſome that he thinks infallible; in both he would

would impoſe upon me the fallacie ἀπὸ τοῦ πῆ, or *a particulari*. All means are not infallible; and there may be, and is other infallible meanes beſides thoſe which he ſuppoſeth and I deny. The Scripture is an infallible mean, to hold to this, I deny the infallibilitie of Councils. And then again ſecondly, I deny a neceſſity of infallible aſſent to all points of queſtion: either part of the contradiction may conſiſt with ſalvation.

For corroboration of his opinion about the infallibilitie of Councils, he brings in afterward St. *Gregory* the Great's ſaying. *I do profeſſe my ſelf to reverence the firſt four Councils as I reverence the four books of the Goſpell. And in like manner I do receive the fifth Council; whoſoever is of another mind, let him be an Anathema.*

*Anſ.* Firſt, we do not think the judgement of St. *Gregory* to be greater than the judgement of the four Councils: if we do not think them infallible, we have no cauſe or reaſon to be urged with one *Gregory*. Secondly, we alſo reverence the learning of that *Gregory*, as he reverenceth the books of the Goſpell, if the *as* be taken in ſimilitude, not proportion; in the quality not equality. Thirdly, if the opinion of St. *Gregory* ſhould prevaile with me, why doth not the Authority of the Fathers whom I produced for our cauſe, and the anſwers I gave to his Authorities, before, prevaile with him. *Teſtem quem quis inducit pro ſe tenetur recipere contra ſe.* Fourthly, let us marke his own words. *And I alſo receive the fifth Council in like manner.* Now the fifth Council was that of *Conſtantinople*, wherein *Vigilius* was condemned in his defence of the three Chapters: And the Council proceeded without his conſent, yea, and againſt his mind. So that if St. *Gregory's* authoritie were authentick the cauſe were ſpoiled; for ſo infalli-

fallibilitie should not be stated in a Council with the Popes confirmation. Fifthly, oppose and confront *Gregary* with *Gregory*, *Nazianzen* with the *Roman*; and which of them shall we believe for Councils? Neither doth the *whole machin of our Religion tople and tumble to the ground* upon my former principle, as he imagineth, though he would presse me more strongly *to shew upon what Authoritie I take Scripture by an infallible assent to be the word of God?* This by the way should not have been brought into question with us, since we give more reverence to the Scriptures than they do, and therefore are like to have a firmer faith in it to be the word of God than they. The main design of my Adversary at first, I suppose, was, to debate the faith of particular points, the Scripture being supposed to be the word of God; although not supposed by him to be the onely rule. But therefore let me returne his own words changing the tables, that the *whole machin of* his *Religion doth tople and tumble to the ground* upon his ground, by pressing him to shew *by what authority he takes Scripture by an infallible assent to be the word of God*, before he hath proved the infallibilitie of the Church.

His reason follows, *because there cannot be a more groundless ground upon which you, by rejecting the infallible authority of the Church, are forced to build your whole religion; to wit, that you by meer reading of Scripture can by its light (as you discover the sun by its light) discover it so manifestly to be the undoubted word of God, that this discovery sufficeth to ground your infallible assent to that verity.*

*Ans.* First he is not surely right in this, that I am forced, by rejecting his way of believing Scripture, to this way. If he be, then I am right in the choice of my

principle

principle upon my refusal of this: but Mr. *Chillingworth* (whom he blames me for differing from in this point) does find (as it may seem, and as he himself profes-seth) a middle way of grounding faith in the Scripture to be the word of God, namely, by the authoritie of universall Tradition: which as any can distinguish from this way, so he doth distinguish from the *Pontifician* way, as is known: but this we shall have fuller occasion to speake of hereafter. Secondly, whereas he saies, that I say *by meer reading of Scripture, &c.* he supposeth that which is not so. For I do not deny the use of other meanes to further us towards our assent, intrinsecall arguments from Scripture, extrinsecall of the Church: but that which privately we resolve our faith of Scripture to be the word of God in, is the autopistie of Scripture, which God by faith infused shews unto us. And by *Catarinus* his reasoning in the Trent Council about subjective certitude of grace, private faith is not inferior to the Catholick faith in point of certaintie, but onely in universalitie. Thirdly, the Church, according to my Adversary hath its power of binding to faith by a Generall Councel with the Popes confirmation of the Decrees: then let us know by what Council all the parts of Scripture were confirmed by a Generall Council with the Popes consent for the first six hundred years; somewhat might be put in as towards the use of some parts of the Apocryphall books: but it doth not appear that they were canonized as to faith; nor any of the Canonicall books declared by them, as *quoad nos*, authentick. For they were wont to meddle with little but emergent questions; whereas of those parts of Scripture which were generally received, there was no question whether they were the word of God. And being not received by the authoritie

of

of a Council eſtabliſhing them, what ground have thoſe who differ from us, to receive them; ſince they ſay, the infallible Authoritie is in the Church Repreſentative with the Popes confirmation.

He goes on. *And it muſt be a far ſurer diſcoverie than that by which we diſcover the Sun by his light, for this diſcovery can onely ground a naturall certaintie: the other muſt ground a ſupernaturall, not certainty, but infallibilitie.*

*Anſ.* The ſupernaturall habit of faith hath it ſelf more to intelligence than to ſcience. Intelligence is known to be that naturall habit, whereby the underſtanding is diſpoſed to aſſent to the truth of principles, when the terms of thoſe principles are known. And faith doth beare more proportion to this, as being the ſupernaturall habit (in regard of cauſe) whereby we are diſpoſed to believe ſupernaturall verities; whereof the firſt is, by our opinion, that the Scripture is the word of God; taking the Scripture materially. Now as the principles naturall are ſeen through their own light by the naturall habit of intelligence: ſo are the ſupernatural principles ſeen through their own light by the ſupernaturall habit of faith. And as certainly as I ſee the Sun by its light with mine eye; ſo certainly do I ſee the truth of naturall principles by the naturall habit of intelligence: and as certainly as I ſee the veritie of naturall principles by intelligence, ſo do I ſee ſupernaturall verities by the ſupernaturall habit of faith; yet not ſo evidently as I ſee the Sun by its light, or naturall principles through their light. But it ſeems by my Adverſary, that this will not ſerve, for he urgeth not onely for a *certainty* but *infallibilitie*. To this we anſwer, firſt, Take certaintie properly, and I think there is no *fundamentum in re* for this diſtinction.

It may be, becauſe we are wont to uſe the term of infallibilitie to points of faith, we think that whatſoever is certain is not infallible: and it is true, in regard of the manner or meane of certaintie, ſo that whatſoever is certain is not infallible; for ſo certaintie ſeems to be more generall: but certainly, whatſoever is to us certaine is alſo infallible, as we take it in a generall ſenſe. But ſecondly, if there be any degree of infallibilitie above certaintie, we have it by this way of Divine faith infuſed by the Spirit of God: becauſe we are moſt ſure of this principle, that God cannot deceive, nor be deceived: therefore what we take upon his word we are moſt certain of, and more than by our own diſcourſe and reaſon; for that is in the nature of it more imperfect. Thirdly, this is not ſo wiſely conſidered, to ſtraine our faith to the higheſt peg of utmoſt infallibilitie, as they determine the ground of it, namely, the Authoritie of the Church: becauſe the Authoritie of it, as it is contradiſtinguiſhed to the Spirit and word, is but humane, and as it is reſolved into the word by the Spirit, ſo it comes into a coincidence with us. Fourthly, whereas he ſometimes upbraided us with an eſſentiall defect of faith, becauſe we take it not by their way of the Church; it appeares yet, that ſome of our Church have in caſe of martyrdome held the faith of Scripture, and of points taken from thence, as infallibly as they have held Scripture upon tenure of the Church. And it ſeems ours did not hold the Scripture, or the points upon the authoritie of the Church; for they differed from the Ponteficians unto the death, about the Church and about points of Doctrine, which the Papiſt urged, they denied; notwithſtanding they were Doctrines of their Church. Now, according to the Pontifician argument, if they had received the Scripture by the Authoritie of the Church

Church, they muſt upon the ſame reaſon have received every Doctrine propoſed by the Church. And therefore, it ſeems, they had a faith of Scripture infallible without the Roman infallibilitie. Secondly, the Spirit of God ſpeaking in the Church is to them the efficient of faith. But the Spirit of God ſpeaks alſo in the Scripture. If not, how do they prove, that the Spirit of God ſpeakes in the Church? if it does, then may we believe him at firſt word and immediately, as to the Church.

As to what he ſaith, *ſecondly* that he *hath ſhewed in* his *laſt chap. ſecond Num.* that a review of the definitions of a Council untill they be reſolved into the rule of Scripture, doth *open a wide gap to hereſie*, I need ſay no more than what hath been ſaid in anſwer thereunto. His meer ſaying ſo doth not ſurely make it ſo: nor is it probable, for it doth not open a gap to hereſie materiall; becauſe Scripture is the rule of truth: nor yet to hereſie formall, becauſe it may be done without oppoſition to the Councils. For ſimple diſſent doth not include formall oppoſition.

But yet further he ſaith. *And for your importance of the matter I will here further declare in an example which hereafter will ſtand me in much uſe. Let us take an Arrian Cobler to this man. This your Doctrine giveth the finall review of the Council of Nice.*

*Anſ.* Yes, (I muſt interpoſe in the ſeverall paſſages of his ſtorie of the caſe) it doth, but how? It doth not give a review by way of authoritie to others: but he is to take his own libertie for his own ſatisfaction in point of faith. Otherwiſe he believes he knows not what, and ſo in proportion he comes under the cenſure of Chriſt, upon the Samaritan woman, in the 4. of St. *John* the 22. Ye worſhip ye

know not what. If the woman was not to be ruled by the judgement of the *Samaritans*, why is a Cobler to be ruled by the authoritie of others; ſince, ſimply, the authoritie of the *Samaritans* was as good as the authoritie of others: and therefore our faith muſt be reſolved into ſome higher ground than the authoritie of men.

He goes on in his caſe. *And you give him leave after he hath peruſed the definitions of this Council (defining God the Son to be of the ſelf ſame individuall ſubſtance with his Father) to examine them untill he find them reſolved into the infallible rule of Scripture.*

*Anſ.* Yes, we ſay he may take his own liberty to do ſo. But alſo we ſay, he ought to conferre with thoſe who are learned, that he may more eaſily finde the ſenſe of Scripture, the advice he takes from others doth not determine his aſſent: but diſpoſeth it. It doth point him to it, but he muſt ſee it with his own ſight.

St. John the 10. chap. 30. verſe.

*He doth examine them and chiefly how they doe agree with that text, I and my Father are one, on which text you afterwards confeſſe the infallibilitie of this definition to be chiefly grounded.*

*Anſ.* So did St. *Athanaſius* profeſſe, as I told him in my laſt rejoinder, and he doth not ſay any thing in deniall. But as to the point as being clear in Scripture, there are other texts plain enough, as in the firſt Epiſtle of St. *John* the fifth chap. the twentieth verſe, *in his ſon Jeſus Chriſt, this is the true God.* Indeed the whole verſe is for our purpoſe. *And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an underſtanding, that we ſhould know him that is true. And we are in him that is true, in his Son Jeſus Chriſt. This is the true God.* He hath given us a mind that we ſhould know. Here is faith infuſed, where-

by

by we know him, and therefore is not this faith an effect of the authoritie of the Church. And this ſon is here ſaid to be the true God, not onely God nuncupatively, as the Arrians and Socinians: but the true God. So *Bartholomeus Petrus*, who makes the Supplement to *Eſtius's* Comment upon the Epiſtles, and ſubjects all to the holy Roman Church; *Et nihil ominus etiam Filius ab Apoſtolo verbis expreſſis nominatur verus Deus parte hujus verſus quarta quæ ſequitur, hic eſt verus Deus.* So he. And notwithſtanding alſo the Son is named by the Apoſtle in expreſſe words the true God in the fourth part of this verſe, this is the true God.

*Now in the examen of the conformitie of this definition with this text, the Arrian Cobler by his poor underſtanding is eaſily able to ſee (that which a wiſer man would yet ſee ſooner) that he is put upon a neceſſitie to inquire how God the Son and his Father are one; whether it be by affection onely, as Arrians hold, or one in the ſelf ſame individuall Subſtance, as the Council deſineth.*

Well. Καὶ τί πρὸς; what then? This is no other than that which ſtands with our duty of obedience to that precept in the firſt Ep. to the *Theſ.* 5. 21. Prove all things; hold faſt that which is good. And ſecondly, were we to reſt in the definition of Councils, yet ſhould we be put upon inquiry into the ſenſe of their words which would make a trouble and a difference, as the words of the Trent Council did to *Soto* and *Viga*. And therefore if he could prejudice our cauſe with perplexities of ambiguities; neither are they certain, by their own Councils, which ſenſe to ſtand to, ſince theſe learned men ſo eagerly combated upon different ſenſes of the words of the Council upon the Decrees about Free-will and Predeſtination: and though they had their *intereſſe* in the Council for

ſer learning and eſtimation; yet, it ſeems, did not know the onely ſenſe and true ſcope of the Synod, as is ſaid of them in the Hiſtory of the Trent Council. p. 216.

My Adverſary goes on. *And inquiring this he cals to mind that other text, John the* 17. 21. *Where Chriſt prayeth, all his Diſciples may be one thing, as thou Father in me and I in thee.* So then let him proceed with the caution of this rule, *res non eſt ſubjecta ſermoni, ſed ſermo rei.* The thing is not ſerviceable to the ſpeech, but the ſpeech to the thing.

*Here will the Cobler ſay (becauſe he hath been often inſtructed by his own Doctors) Chriſt who ſaid, I and my Father are one thing, demandeth that his Diſciples may be one thing as he and his Father are one thing; but he doth not demand, that his Diſciples may be all one thing in the ſelf ſame individuall ſubſtance, therefore (he concludes) Chriſt is not one thing in the ſelf ſame individuall ſubſtance with his Father, but one thing in affection onely, as his Diſciples might come to be one thing.*

*Anſ.* But this Cobler if he had more mind to finde truth in Scripture than his own opinion, might goe on and ſee, that the Jews (who were like to underſtand the words of Chriſt, as obſerving what was ſaid by him to them) underſtood Chriſt not to ſpeak that they were one by way of affection. For becauſe of this ſpeech they took up ſtones to caſt at him, becauſe he being a man made himſelf God, as it is in the 33 ver. of the 10. ch. of St. *John*. Which interpretation of his words our Saviour did not in the following verſes deny; although he ſeemed to wave that ſenſe; and yet alſo in effect brought it in by an ἐμπεριχώρησις in the 38 ver. Secondly, although, if there had been no other text concerning Chriſt's Divinity, there would not have been ſo clear a concluſion from the text, of the Divinity of Chriſt: yet if we compare

pare it with other paſſages of the Scriptures, we may well believe that ſenſe, and alſo if the text doth not afford that ſenſe, how ſhall we believe a Councill, when the Councill of *Nice* (as *Athanaſius* ſaid) urged this text thrice againſt the Arrians? And therefore this exception againſt the ſufficient clearneſſe of Scripture in this point muſt be withdrawn, or elſe they muſt condemne themſelves, becauſe the Councill of *Nice* determined the point not by their authority, but by the text. And therefore cannot the Cobler ſay (as my Adverſary prompts him) *falſe therefore is this definition of the Council which cannot be reſolved into the infallible word of God, in which all things neceſſary to Salvation (as this point is) are plainly ſet down, as this place is not.* My Adverſary firſt might have ſpoken more moderately; not *falſe is it therefore which the Council hath defined*, but, not neceſſary, becauſe the ſenſe of the words may be ſuch when they are ſpoken betwixt God or him and his Diſciples, therefore they are ſuch between his Father and him, this is no rationall inference. *Duo cum idem dicunt, non eſt idem.* When two ſay the ſame thing, it is not the ſame thing ſaid. So when one ſaies the ſame thing in divers reſpects, it is not the ſame in ſenſe preſently, becauſe in words. And if it be ſaid, this is the queſtion, whether it be ſaid in divers reſpects? we anſwer, that we do not here ſpeake of divers reſpects formall, but objective, for even according to the Principles of the Arrian, Chriſt is not an ordinary man, as appeares by their poſition, Ἦν ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν, there was a time when he was not, and therefore there is no reaſon to expound the words in the ſame ſenſe when they are applied to God and Chriſt, as when they are applied to God, or Chriſt and the Diſciples. Secondly, the definition of the Councill is not falſe, if this point cannot

not be reſolved into the infallible word of God; but my opinion is falſe; unleſſe he thinks my opinion is the ſame with the definition of the Council: and if ſo, then the Council holds, that all things neceſſary are reſolvable into plain Scripture; and if ſo, then by his opinion he ſhould ſtand to this definition; and if ſo, he ſhould yield the cauſe. Thirdly, the Pontificians have no ſuch cauſe to ſtand ſo punctually for the neceſſary belief of the Divinity of the Son of God, becauſe according to their Champion, *Bellarmin* in his fifth *b. de Mediatore*, he holds, that Chriſt is not a Mediator according to both natures, but only in regard of the humane nature, *ratione formalis principii*, for though he ſays, Chriſt be a Mediator according to both natures, *ratione ſuppoſiti*, and as *Principium quod*; yet is not his Divinity ſo neceſſary as by being Mediator in regard of his Divine nature, as the formall principle, and as *a principium quo*: becauſe thus the Divine nature is more neceſſary *per ſe*. But thirdly, either the definition of the Council is true or falſe; if true, then is it for us; if falſe, then how ſhall we truſt any?

He goes on. *For this is the plaineſt place. And yet conferring it with the other, I finde it not evidently agreeing with the definition of the Council, but rather evidently againſt it; by which I conclude (in this my Review) the definition of the Council to be falſe.*

*Anſ.* Whether this be the plaineſt place is a queſtion; ſince there are other texts, unto which this ambiguitie is not incident, as, beſides that named before, St. *Mat.* 28. 19. Baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghoſt; where the three Divine Perſons have one name, namely, one authoritie and therefore eſſence, and this text doth not a little puzzle the Socinian. And yet ſecondly,

condly, if the ſenſe of the text were, that Chriſt and his Father were one in affection, it doth not follow therefore, that it is evidently rather againſt the definition of the Council: becauſe they may be ſaid to be one in affection, ſince they are one in nature, that which affirms ſo much doth not alwaies exclude more; therefore unleſſe it were ſaid they were one in affection onely, it would not be evidently againſt the Council. But if the text, by compare with the other, did make this ſenſe of being one in affection, it would not import excluſively, that they are one in affection onely. Therefore though the text did not inferre the Councils meaning; yet, upon the ſuppoſition, the Arrian Cobler could not conclude the definition of the Council to be abſolutely falſe, ſince the text doth not conclude a falſitie of that poſition: becauſe to be one in affection, and to be one in eſſence, it doth not imply; for if they be one in eſſence, they are one in affection. So then, if my Adverſary makes the Cobler to conclude the definition of the Council falſe, as to the matter, that the ſon of God is coeſſentiall with the Father, it is inconſequent: if reſpectively to the text, whereby they prove it, then it is indeed conſequent, that the definition of the Council was falſe, but then we make a certain Concluſion of it for our uſe, that the definition of the Council of *Nice* was not infallible. And if ſo, my Adverſary is undone.

And now alſo I take leave to be even with my Adverſary. He takes the Arrian Cobler for his example. I take the Popiſh Collier. To this man the Roman Doctors (as my Adverſary thinks) give no finall reſolution of his faith, but in the Church. They give him no leave to peep into Scripture for the ſetling his belief. Or if his Doctors do very tenderly let fall to him any intimation of Scripture ſo far as to con-

firme by it the infallibilitie of his Church, then ſurely that which ſeems to ſpeak moſt for their turne, and is in the mouth of all of them, namely, St. *Mat.* 16. 18. *I ſay unto thee thou art* Peter, *and upon this Rock will I build my Church, &c. through the nineteenth v.* Well, but will his Doctors give him leave to examin this Interpretation of the text with any other? Dare they? Very hardly. They tell him, he may ſecurely reſt his faith and ſoule in the Authority of the Church. But here is the queſtion, whether the Church doth rightly interpret the text on their own behalf. If they ſay, it is plain that that is the ſenſe; we reply, then may other texts be plain alſo for us. Yea, it is not plain: for the ancient Fathers of the Church have differed from them upon the expoſition, therefore the Popiſh Collier ſhould have leave for once from the inquiſition, by a diſpenſation of the Pope, to inquire, as well as the Arrian Cobler, into the ſenſe of the text, and therefore *by his poor underſtanding (which yet a wiſer man would ſee ſooner)* he doth diſcerne, by comparing it with the twentieth of *John.* 21, 22, 23. ver. That it is not reaſonable to expound the former text of ſuch an authority to be given to St *Peter*, which was not in the latter given to the reſt of the Apoſtles; ſpecially ſince *Bellarmin* is wiſely carefull, that the Princedome of the Church ſhould not be given to St. *Peter*, till after his Reſurrection, leſt St. *Peter's* Succeſſors ſhould not be delivered from danger of ſucceeding him in the deniall of his Maſter. Now then, if equall authoritie be given to all the Apoſtles, (as St. *Cyprian* plainly alſo in his *Tract at. de ſimplicitate Prælatorum, hoc erant utique et cæteri Apoſtoli quod fuit* Petrus, *pari conſortio præditi et honoris et poteſtatis*; and a little before ſaies that Chriſt gave all the Apoſtles, after his Reſurrection, *parem poteſtatem*, equall authority) how

how ſhall he collect from the other, that to be the Prince of the Apoſtles, and to be ordinary Paſtor of the whole Church was given to St. *Peter*? Now then is this Collier at a plunge, he doth not ſee it in the former text by conferring it with the latter; and therefore he concludes (according to my Adverſary for the Cobler) that this doth not agree with the definition of the Doctors, *but rather is evidently againſt it, by which he concludes (in this his review) the definition of the* Roman Doctors to *be falſe.*

And yet *this is the plaineſt text* for them. And therefore let the Popiſh Collier be convinced *by ſome clearer Argument out of Scripture*, to believe as the Church believeth: or elſe, *to the eternall good of miſled ſouls*, confeſſe, that if you give not private men leave finally to reſolve themſelves in Scripture, the Roman *can finde no means* upon earth to put an end unto the main controverſies, the Church *not ſufficing for this end*: unleſſe we ſhould take the Church as commending us to Scripture for our direction, *under pain of being accounted* not Chriſtians. For how are we bound, upon pain of Damnation, to believe that Jeſus is the Chriſt without that which is written in Scripture?

But it will be ſaid, that the Popiſh Collier ſhould not have leave given him to examine the Scripture's ſenſe, no more than the Arrian Cobler ſhould have leave to examine the Councils definition: but both ſhould abſolutely reſt in the definition of a Council. To this we anſwer ſeverall things. Firſt, it is a mighty prejudice to the Roman cauſe, that they account blind obedience to the Church, a duty. This darke lantern, that none ſhould ſee them but their own men, breeds great ſuſpition. The Roman cannot perſwade the Arrian to reſt in a Council, and therefore a Council will not make an end with all of all

controverſies. Thirdly, if the Arrian were to reſt in a Council, he would ſay the Council of *Ariminum* were as conſiderable to him as the Council of Nice to the *Homorſiaſts*. Fourthly, General Councils, for the pureſt times of the Church, were not celebrated: and therefore this is not the univerſall way of ſatisfaction and abſolute determinative of faith. Fifthly, we have no prejudice againſt the four General Councils; we embrace them, and they make no prejudice againſt us, therefore if we hold, as they hold, points of faith, we are as ſaveable as they. Sixthly, the *plaineſt* Council they have for them is the Council of *Trent*, and yet the Popiſh Collier cannot *acquieſce* in that: becauſe (although they ſay it was) yet he may doubt whether it was a free Generall Council. And I hope, ſince my Adverſary ſaies we muſt take infallibility from the Generall Council, we may have leave to examine whether that was a free Generall Council. And here we muſt contradiſtinguiſh the Church unto the Council, and we muſt not believe the Council for the Church; for then the infallibilitie would lie in the Church, not in the Council. Well, and muſt we take the Councill to be right and good from it ſelf? ſuppoſe we were to receive undiſputedly the Decrees of faith in a Generall Council; yet we muſt be aſſured firſt, that this was a Generall free Counceil, then it is left us to examine the Council, though not the definitions: for if the Scripture cannot prove it ſelf, as they ſuppoſe, then the Councill cannot, and therefore the Popiſh Collier may examine the Council. And how ſhall he content himſelf about the Councill in the generalitie of it, ſince there was ſo few perſons in it, ſometimes but forty three, Legates and Abbots being put in: and ſome titular Biſhops onely, ſometimes forty eight; for a good while not above ſixty; the Prelates of other Nations not there;

not

not a Biſhop or Divine of all *Germany* there; in the yeare 1546 no French Biſhop could be there, and therefore no Generall Council. As the French King ſaid, page 314. and by reaſon of the paucitie of the perſons then there, forty eight Biſhops and five Cardinalls; and not one of the Prelates remarkable for learning; and ſome of them Lawyers, and ſome Courtiers, the Decrees of the Council about *Apocryphall books and making authenticall a tranſlation differing from the Originall*, did diſpleaſe in *Germany*; as it is ſet down in the Hiſtory of the Trent Conncil, p. 163. * And for the freeneſſe of it, the Collier might deny that by ſeverall paſſages; for abſolute autority was given to the Legats of the Pope to procreed without conſent of Council, p. 113. Derogations from the liberty of the Council noted, p. 232. the Biſhop of *Fieſole* complained of to the Pope for reaſonable freedom, p. 167, 8. Amongſt the three things the Pope admoniſhed his Legates, one was, *to take heed that by no means the Popes authority be diſputed on, p.* 164. And yet this is the point which formally denominates the Popiſh Religion. And his being Head of the univerſall Church, as he preſumes, is the point which denominates their Church the Roman Catholick. Yea, it was proteſted againſt by the French King; which was of force againſt it, according to ſome *prohibentis conditio potior*, as p. 320. And therefore cannot the Popiſh Collier finally reſolve his faith in a Council upon its own conciliarie authority. And aſſuredly, if the Arrian Cobler and the Popiſh Collier were both to diſpute the ſame point; one by the Scripture, the other by the Council, the Cobler would ſooner convince the Collier by Scripture, which he doth acknowledge as certain, than the Collier the Cobler by the Council, which he doth not acknowledge ſo: yea, if the Collier and the Cobler were equally diſpoſed to finde truth

truth indifferently to their opinions, the Cobler might ſooner ſettle his mind in Scripture, than the Collier in a Council; for the Cobler hath no more to do than to finde out the ſenſe of Scripture, and then he is ſatisfied: but the Collier, when he hath found out the ſenſe of the Council, is not ſatisfied; becauſe, if he were aſſured that a free and generall Council was infallible, he might yet doubt of the *hypotheſis*, whether this Council were ſo. But it is falſe in theſe, that a generall Council, though free, is infallible, and that we are bound to believe ſo; for why then would not the Pope put the main queſtion out of queſtion? Either he did ſuſpect the point himſelf, or did ſuſpect his own Subjects in the Council, or did ſuſpect, that it did not bind unto neceſſary belief, or elſe he was deceived in point of prudence, (which is moſt unlikely) to have that waved.

Num. 5. He proceeds. *This your Doctrine maketh the definitions of true Councils, and their finall determinations, to be indeed no definitions nor finall determinations at all.*

*Anſ.* This, in reaſoning, would prove a Schiſme, *a dicto ſecundum quid.* Becauſe I deny them to be *finall* in your ſenſe, therefore I deny them to be finall in all ſenſe, is not conſequent. It doth not follow from the deniall of one ſpecies to the deniall of all. Finall definitions, as to humane Tribunals, I acknowledge them: but finall ſo, as to exclude the examination of them by Scripture, I deny. Final, as to peace, and not to be refractary, I grant: but finall, as to neceſſary aſſent upon the Councils account, I deny. That we may finde truth by them, I yield; becauſe ſo many abilities united with Gods bleſſing, may be like to pitch upon that true ſenſe of Scripture which may determine the judgement unto certaine

tain aſſent. As by the conflict of hard things ſparkes of fire do break out: ſo by the induſtrious diſcuſſion of opinions, truth may appear eminently. But we cannot conclude the definitions, intuitively, and *ipſo facto*, infallible. And why ſhould we be obliged to ſtand to their declaration of truth, as if they did alſo make it to be truth? And why ſhould we ſtand to their Concluſions, when their diſcourſe is fallible, unleſſe they go by Scripture? And if they by Scripture examine opinions, why ſhould not we by Scripture examine their definitions, as to our ſelves? Which ſhould be laſt in the determination, Council, or Scripture, when Councils begin by it, and determine with it? Therefore I do not make them in no ſenſe finall; or none. That which follows, *Now ſurely it is cleare. &c.* unto the end of the number, how little ſtrength of reaſon hath it? This, in effect, was anſwered immediately before. My Adverſary does us right in confeſſing our acknowledgement of the firſt four Generall Councils. And alſo may we confeſſe, that we think *they thought they had all plenitude of power and authority from God to define, and finally to determine thoſe Controverſies*; but what then? 1. What if they thought ſo? We have liberty by our principles to think that inconcludent, becauſe we hold them not infallible in their judgement. Not becauſe they thought they had ſuch power, therefore they had it; unleſſe we ſhould hold them infallible, as we do not. Neither is this thought of ours, that they might think amiſs of ſuch power to be in them, any prejudice to our acknowledgement of thoſe firſt four General Councils; becauſe this opinion of theirs is no part of their determinations. Secondly, we diſtinguiſh: All plenitude of power is taken either reduplicatively, or ſpecificatively for all that power which belongs to the whole Church; the former, if

their

their opinion of themſelves were infallible, would ſerve his turne: but we deny that they thought they had all power ſo; and if they did think ſo, we think they did not think right: the latter power they might think they had and not think amiſſe, but this ſerves not the turn; for all authority of the Church doth not bind us to receive the definitions thereof ſo as to ſink all examination of the truth thereof by Scripture. Have not other courts a plenitude of power to hear and determine cauſes; and yet are ſometimes defective in point of law? Their fallibility doth not proceed from want of power or authoritie, but from want of judgement or will to give a right ſentence. And yet their cenſures alſo proceed. And therefore the excommunications (which my Adverſary objects to me) may neither import their faith of their infallibilitie, nor yet wrong *to all ſuch as ſhould gainſay what they had defined and determined, if error and falſitie and contradiction to Scripture could be found in their definitions and determinations*; for firſt it is not fallibilitie of ſentence that doth the wrong, but falſity, either by ignorance, (and ſo *ignorantia in Judice reputatur pro dolo*) or elſe by wilfulneſſe, (which formally makes the injurie, becauſe intended.) Secondly, the excommunications proceed againſt the perſon for an outward act of obſtinacie, and not for a diſſent of judgment (for *cogitationis pœnam in noſtro foro nemo luit*) ſo then there is no wrong to him that gainſays by excommunication; for that ſimply he might keep his judgment. And alſo thirdly, the Judge though he judgeth not well, yet may do well, if he judgeth with competent knowledge and due integrity, and therefore is it no injury if he does his beſt, ſince God hath not thought fit on the behalfe of publick peace, to diſannull humane Judicatures for humane infirmities.

His

His Anſwer to my inſtance of the Bereans (who ſearched the Scripture daily to ſee whether that which St. *Paul* ſaid was true) my Adverſary doth referre to another Chapter. We ſtay his leiſure.

*Whereas you adde fourthly, that the decisions of the Church though unprovided of infallibilitie, do yet oblige unto peace, though their judgement cannot claime an undisputed assent, yet the power they have from Christ doth require an undisturbance in the difference, you teach by words what the deed of your glorious Reformers have notoriously gainsaid.* Num. 6.

To this it is readily anſwered, that Reformers may be glorious as to the generall effect, though it's poſſible for them to be extravagant *in modo*. Sober buſineſſes may be managed with too much heate. Secondly, whereas he ſuppoſeth that our glorious Reformers did notoriouſly gainſay the whole Church, I deny it; and if they did not gaineſay the whole Church, it doth not come home to his purpoſe: for he is upon the authority of the whole Church. They did gainſay the Roman Church, but not the whole Church. That which St. *Jerom* ſaid in his Epiſtle to *Evagrius*, is yet for our uſe; *ſi authoritas queritur, orbis major eſt urbe*, if authority be lookt after, the world is greater than a City, which was alſo ſpoken in application to *Rome*. And put caſe there were no ſort of Chriſtians that did not profeſſe obedience to the Roman Church, when thoſe glorious Reformers did firſt appeare, yet it cannot be rationally ſaid by the Romaniſt, that they did gainſay the whole Church, becauſe the Romaniſt doth take the root of his Church from the primitive times; which thoſe Reformers did not gainſay. So then as we deny to them that they were all the whole Church, when the Reformers did begin: ſo if they had, it would be nothing as to the gainſaying of the whole Church,

becauſe the whole Church in their ſence doth include all times, and ſpecially the primitive; which they did not contradict. And ſurely if the Romaniſt proves his Church by conformitie to the Primitive, (otherwiſe he hath the leſſe reaſon for himſelf) then muſt he interpretatively grant, that there is more authority of the Primitive Church, than of that preſent Roman. And ſo then if the Reformers gainſaid not the primitive, they gainſaid not the Catholick in the beſt part of it for time; and that alſo which the preſent Roman doth moſt, as they ſay, depend upon. Thirdly, therefore we do not take our Religion from thoſe Reformers as being worne into their words; and therefore we do not impropriate Chriſtianity by any ſingular perſons: we might take hints from them to conſider thoſe Doctrines which they preached, and conferring them with Antiquity and Scripture, we believe them to be Apoſtolicall; and ſo is our Church, by *Tertullian's* rule in his book of Preſcriptions, ch. 32. *In eadem fide conſpirantes non minus Apoſtolicæ deputantur pro conſanguinitate Doctrinæ*, thoſe Churches that conſpire in the faith are not leſſe accounted Apoſtolical for the conſanguinity of Doctrine. Fourthly, thoſe Reformers, even according to my Adverſaries Principles, did not oppoſe themſelves to the authoritie of the whole Church: becauſe, according to him, the authority of the Church is onely binding in a Council with the Popes conſent; and no Generall Council can be found which did eſtabliſh the points of Doctrine and Diſcipline wherein we differ, before thoſe Reformers did ſhew themſelves: for the Trent Councill (which alſo is not a generall Council) was after their beginning, as is known, and it was called upon their occaſion. Fifthly, as for our Reformation in *England* from the incroachments of the Court of

*Rome*

*Rome*, it was first made by men of the Roman faith. So then my Adversary gets nought by this exception. And if the Romanists object to us reformation in Doctrine against the Church, as in the time of King *Edward* the sixth, we reply, as before, that we did not oppose the Church Catholick, we left the Roman as they left the Catholick Church. The whole is greater than the part, and therefore had we reason to leave them. *Omne reducitur ad principium*, which is a rule of *Aquinas*. We are in Doctrine as the Church was in the times of the Apostles. Our defence is in *Tertullian* in his book of *Præscr.* 35. ch. *Posterior nostra nes non est; imo omnibus prior est, &c. Our cause is not more moderne, but more antient than all. This shall be the Testimony of truth every where, obtaining the superiority.* Ab Apostolis utique non damnatur, imo defenditur; *it is not condemned by the Apostles, nay, it is defended. This shall be the indication of propriety: for those who do not condemne it who have condemned whatsoever is extraneous, do shew it to be theirs, and therefore do defend it.*

The second inconvenience, which he urgeth, of my Principles, to draw me to his, is none. *Secondly, seeing that a Generall Council (as you in your first paper confesse) is the highest Court on earth to hear and determine controversies, &c. What then? unlesse, all were bound to confirme and subscribe to erroneous definitions, and all Preachers were silenced, and obliged not to open their mouths against their errors.*

This he attributes to me, as if I said it, or my opinion did inferre it; whereas neither is true. Nay, nor did he find in my papers, that erroneous definitions of a Generall Council (though the highest Court) are to be *accepted peaceably, reverently, and without disturbance*; namely, so as to accept them in assent

as true; for that would be impoſſible: they may be accepted, and reverently, and without diſturbance, as to peace in not oppoſing; though not as to faith in ſubmiſſion of Judgement: and becauſe they may thus be accepted, will it therefore follow, that we are therefore *bound to confirme and ſubſcribe to erroneous definitions*? By no meanes. I do not remember that I uſed the terme of *accepting*; and yet if I did, it might be conſtrued *in ſenſu commodo*, ſo as not to diſturb the peace of the Church, and quietly to endure the cenſure. But there is a vaſt difference betwixt not oppoſing and conforming or ſubſcribing. For not to oppoſe, is negative: to conforme, or ſubſcribe, is a poſitive act. Not to oppoſe, reſpects the definition as a publick act; to conforme, or ſubſcribe, reſpects it as true, which I cannot do, ſuppoſing it erroneous. Not to oppoſe, regards the Judgement of the Church as authoritative: to conforme or ſubſcribe, regards the judgement of the Church, as at leaſt, not erring in the definition.

And as for that he ſaies, that by my confeſſion, all *Preachers are ſilenced and obliged not to open their mouths againſt theſe errors*. I anſwer firſt, by diſtinguiſhing of the matter of the error. If the matter of the error be not great, as not deſtroying an article of faith, it might be better quietly to tollerate it, than publickly to ſpeak againſt it: if the matter of the error be repugnant to an article of faith, then we diſtinguiſh of the manner of ſpeaking againſt it; and we ſay we may ſoberly refer it to another general Council, if any be in view. If not, we may ſpeak the truth poſitively without oppoſition to the authoritie of the Church, ſo as to vilify or contemn it. Yea, further, if the Council be free and general, it being ſo qualified, it is not like to erre in any decree repugnant to a main

main article of faith: and therefore the queſtion about ſpeaking againſt it, is in this caſe well taken away. And yet further, admitting, and not granting, that ſuch a Council ſhould erre in defining that which is contrary to an article of faith; yet muſt my Adverſary have ſuppoſed by his principles that the truth contrary to this error hath been eſtabliſhed by ſome other generall Council; or elſe, according to him, the Church hath not ſufficiently provided how to ſettle us infallibly in matters of faith; ſince, according to him, we muſt reſolve our faith ultimately in the Decrees of Generall Councils, and then Council will contradict Council, and therefore will not a Council be a ground of faith, becauſe one may contradict another, and alſo we may ſpeak by vertue of the former Council againſt the error of the latter. And therefore *the whole Church of God* is not *in a pitifull caſe* by any thing of what I ſaid in reverence to Councils without abſolute obedience. But to be ſure the Church would be in a pitifull caſe, if indeed we were bound to receive intuitively all definitions of Councils in whatſoever matters; for then ſhould we be bound to ſubmit our conſcience to a Council againſt our conſcience, ſince it is not yet proved infallible, and this makes for the inward act a contradiction; for the outward, hypocriſie. And ſurely, if that which is moſt hard is moſt eaſily broken, (as was ſaid by one in the Trent Council) then that he urgeth is eaſily anſwered: for there is, to be ſure, leſſe danger in not ſpeaking againſt that which is falſe, as he would have me ſay; than in yielding to all as infallibly true, as he would have me believe.

And therefore that which follows returnes with more force upon my Adverſary, *mutatis mutandis*. A pitifull thing it would be, if the Church were bound to believe all definitions of a Council, which

are

are not yet proved, nor ever will be, not to be fallible; and consequently some that may be false, *which being by command from the highest authoritie upon earth preached by so many, and not so much as to* be confiwered *by one, would needs increase to a wonderfull height. Would any wise Law-maker proceed thus, if they could helpe it as well as Christ could by continuing in* his word written *that infallibilitie,* which my Adversary hath confessed, or must, that it always had and shall have.

As for *the infallibility of the Church for two thousand yeares before Scripture was written, and that which this Church of Christ had before all the whole canon of the new Testament was finished, which was for the first forty yeares of the Church.*

This we have spoken to sufficiently before. And this doth at most inferre (upon a supposition, that the Church was for that time infallible, which yet we grant not) a possibilitie of it to be infallible still. It doth not inferre an actuall infallibilitie still. Because God did so then, therefore he did so after the word was written, is as good an Argument as this; because God made an extroardinary light for the time before the Sun was created, therefore we must not now be directed by the light of the Sun. As if because God did sufficiently rule his Church without general Councils for the first three hundred yeares, therefore we should not make use of Councils now. And then we say, secondly, we must not compare the two thousand yeares before any word was written but onely with the time of the Church when the Gospel was not written (as for fortie years after Christ untill the Canon was finished) and so it bears some proportion: but it is not to be compared with the other times of the Church after the finishing of the Canon. For then the word was to be the ordinary

standing

ſtanding rule, without Prophets or Apoſtles. Thirdly, was there any thing neceſſary conſigned by tradition to the Church which was not put into writing? This cannot be ſaid; becauſe then God ſhould have provided for his Church worſe afterwards by writing. And if it be ſaid that the writing of the word doth not exclude the word not written, which is tradition, let them tell me why, when all was in tradition before, ſomewhat was put into writing, and ſomewhat left in the way of tradition. And then alſo let them tell me how that of our Saviour ſhould be true, *St. John the fifth* 39. *Search the Scriptures, for in them you think to have eternall life, and they are they which teſtifie of me.*, if any thing neceſſary were left in tradition, how could they have eternall life in the Scriptures? So then, ſince all that was neceſſary was committed to writing; why then was not that whereby the Church was ruled for forty *years before the Canon was finiſhed* written alſo as well as before? and then your tradition (which you contradiſtinguiſh to Scripture) is evacuated. Or let me know why we may not as well deny the Roman traditions in point of faith after the finiſhing of the Canon, as our Saviour did the traditions of the Phariſes after their Canon was finiſhed? And why then ſhould we not apply to them that of our Saviour to the Jews. St. *Mat.* 15. 9. In vaine do they worſhip me, teaching for Doctrine the traditions of men. Might not the Phariſees as well have put their traditions into their *Miſhna*, which (as the tradition is) was delivered by word of mouth from God to *Moſes*, from *Moſes* to *Joſhuah*, from *Joſhuah* to the ſeventie, from them to the Church? And fourthly, my Adverſary ſpeakes this in favour of Generall Councils; does he not? If he does not, his diſcourſe doth not well cohere, if he does, he does not conſider, that for the

two

two thousand yeares there was no generall Councel, nor for the first forty of the Christian Church. Nor much for the first three hundred years. And what consequence can be then drawn from his words against me for my deniall of being obliged absolutely to Councils? If the Church were infallible, even without Councils, it would contradict me, who say, that the Church is not infallible, even by Councils: but since he sayes, now the Church is infallible by Councils, if it were infallible without Councils, it would contradict him, who says, it is infallible in and by Councils: because he placeth the infallibilitie in Councils, so as that he will not stand to any infallibilitie of the Church without them.

Num. 7. In the seventh Number he doth indeavour to free me from the fear of hypocrisie *in differing by an outward act from our inward act of belief.* But his indeavour is not sufficient. To differ by my outward act of subscribing from my inward act of belief, is hypocrisie: but if I subscribe to that which I do not assent unto as true, I must differ by my outward act from my inward act: and therefore will it be hypocrisie. To the assumption he would now give me satisfaction, by perswading me that my inward act of assent may well go along with my outward act of subscribing. His reason is this, *for any wise man may inwardly perswade himself, that although I, by my force of wit, cannot see how such a point defined by a whole General Council should be true; yet, if I have wit, I cannot but perswade my self, even according to humane wisdome, that so grave a judgement of a whole Council is far more likely to see the truth, than my private judgement, and therefore rather to be interiourly imbraced.*

*Ans.* And is this all he can say to move me to change

change my opinion? First he ſeems to ſuppoſe that we cannot ſee ſufficient reaſon in all the determinations of a Council; and ſo far he ſpeaks ingenuouſly, becauſe it is a prejudice againſt himſelf. Secondly, there are ſo many doubts of a free generall Council about the morall exiſtence of it, that I had need of ſome Divine faith to believe, that ſuch or ſuch is a free Generall Council. And that there may be ſuch ſcruples of ſuch a Council he himſelf afterwards gives me intimation of. Thirdly, all this I can give you the free uſe of; for it will do me no harme. The diſcourſe is peccant upon the ignorance of the *Elench*, for this is in terms reconcilable to our cauſe; yea, and alſo almoſt all that follows to the end of the number; for they do not prove *a captivating of the ſoul into the obedience of faith, as the Apoſtle ſpeaketh*; but at moſt but a diſpoſing of the mind of the perſon againſt oppoſition. As you do conclude, you conclude above your premiſſes: as you ſhould conclude from your premiſſes before, you can conclude nothing againſt me. For fourthly, all that is ſaid there makes no more than a probability of that to be right which is defined by the Council. For, put caſe it ſeems ſo to all in a generalitie, or to moſt, or to the wiſeſt, and of them to all, or moſt of the wiſer of them, this is but probable, according to *Ariſtotle's* account. And then I will deny it, that every Council is ſo qualified. If it were, this probabilitie makes but a ſtrong opinion, but not faith. And therefore the Romaniſt doth unadviſedly urge neceſſity of faith upon grounds infallible, before they can give us grounds infallible. And therefore fifthly, as for his *Dilemma*, it will not take. It is this: *Either the places againſt the definitions of the Council are clear, or not*: if not, they are more likely *to hit upon the truth than I am*: *if clear and evident, then it is an evident*

two thousand yeares there was no generall Councell, nor for the first forty of the Christian Church. Nor much for the first three hundred years. And what consequence can be then drawn from his words against me for my deniall of being obliged absolutely to Councils? If the Church were infallible, even without Councils, it would contradict me, who say, that the Church is not infallible, even by Councils: but since he sayes, now the Church is infallible by Councils, if it were infallible without Councils, it would contradict him, who says, it is infallible in and by Councils; because he placeth the infallibilitie in Councils, so as that he will not stand to any infallibilitie of the Church without them.

Num. 7. In the seventh Number he doth indeavour to free me from the fear of hypocrisie *in differing by an outward act from our inward act of belief.* But his indeavour is not sufficient. To differ by my outward act of subscribing from my inward act of belief, is hypocrisie: but if I subscribe to that which I do not assent unto as true, I must differ by my outward act from my inward act: and therefore will it be hypocrisie. To the assumption he would now give me satisfaction, by perswading me that my inward act of assent may well go along with my outward act of subscribing. His reason is this, *for any wise man may inwardly perswade himself, that although I, by my force of wit, cannot see how such a point defined by a whole General Council should be true; yet, if I have wit, I cannot but perswade my self, even according to humane wisdome, that so grave a judgement of a whole Council is far more likely to see the truth, than my private judgement, and therefore rather to be interiourly imbraced.*

*Ans.* And is this all he can say to move me to change

change my opinion? Firſt he ſeems to ſuppoſe that we cannot ſee ſufficient reaſon in all the determinations of a Council; and ſo far he ſpeaks ingenuouſly, becauſe it is a prejudice againſt himſelf. Secondly, there are ſo many doubts of a free generall Council about the morall exiſtence of it, that I had need of ſome Divine faith to believe, that ſuch or ſuch is a free Generall Council. And that there may be ſuch ſcruples of ſuch a Council he himſelf afterwards gives me intimation of. Thirdly, all this I can give you the free uſe of; for it will do me no harme. The diſcourſe is peccant upon the ignorance of the *Eleuth*, for this is in terms reconcilable to our cauſe; yea, and alſo almoſt all that follows to the end of the number; for they do not prove *a captivating of the ſoul into the obedience of faith, as the Apoſtle ſpeaketh*; but at moſt but a diſpoſing of the mind of the perſon againſt oppoſition. As you do conclude, you conclude above your premiſſes: as you ſhould conclude from your premiſſes before, you can conclude nothing againſt me. For fourthly, all that is ſaid there makes no more than a probability of that to be right which is defined by the Council. For, put caſe it ſeems ſo to all in a generalitie, or to moſt, or to the wiſeſt, and of them to all, or moſt of the wiſer of them, this is but probable, according to *Ariſtotle's* account. And then I will deny it, that every Council is ſo qualified. If it were, this probabilitie makes but a ſtrong opinion, but not faith. And therefore the Romaniſt doth unadviſedly urge neceſſity of faith upon grounds infallible, before they can give us grounds infallible. And therefore fifthly, as for his *Dilemma*, it will not take. It is this: *Either the places againſt the definitions of the Council are clear, or not*: if not, they are more likely *to hit upon the truth than I am*: *if clear and evident, then it is an evident*

*and clear folly in me to thinke, that ſo wiſe an Aſſembly ſhould have ſo vniverſall a blindneſſe, as that none of them ſhould be able to diſcover that which is cleare and evident even to my ſhort ſight*; alas, how far comes this ſhort of infallible ſatisfaction? And beſides, how many may diſſemble what they ſee? Who ſo blinde as he that will not ſee? If the *Chinttes* ſay, they onely themſelves ſee with both eyes; thoſe of *Europe* with one eye; and the reſt of the world with neither; ſurely thoſe of *Europe* who will not ſee are blinde of both eyes. The Council of Trent, according to them an Oecumenicall Council, if they could ſee better things not cleare, why did they not in all points declare, firſt what was to be held, and then what was to be anathametized? And if they were more like to ſee what is cleare, how came they to abandon the uſe of the cup? Nay, how came they to eſtabliſh a tranſubſtantiation, ſeing our Saviour after conſecration ſaid plainly, St. *Mark* the 14. the 25. I will drink no more of the fruit of the Vine? Was his blood the fruit of the Vine? But ſixthly, to make uſe of his disjunction, *places are either cleare or not*, namely, places of Scripture; if not cleare, no abſolute neceſſity of a generall Council, ſo as no ſalvation to be had without clearing the difficulty; if clear, what need then of a Council? we may be ſaved without ſome knowledge: we cannot believe without infallibility. Seventhly, let them reconcile this neceſſity of a Council to the ſayings of *Paul* the fourth, who ſaid he had abſolute authority; that for himſelf he had no need of inſtruction, becauſe he knew Chriſt did command; that he had no need of a Council, for he himſelf was above all; that he could remedie all inconveniences by his own authority; as is ſaid of him in the Hiſtory of Trent, the fifth book. And therefore my Adverſary or the Pope is

out.

out. All he ſaies here alſo for Councils makes no more than a morall aſſurance; which how much it is leſſe than the certainty of faith, Mr. *Knot* will tell.

Indeed he ſays, *Again, I may, and ought to know, that the Holy Ghoſt hath promiſed an aſſiſtance to his Church ſufficient to ſecure it from bringing in any error, as I ſhall ſhew, chap.* 4. Yes ſurely; if this could be proved, there were no more to be ſaid: *this principle will beat down to the ground all oppoſition, which an humble ſoule can make.* We confeſſe it, when it is proved. But ſurely this is as much in queſtion as any thing elſe. Untill the ſuppoſition be grown into a proof, we have then yet but prudentiall Arguments to faith. And yet we ſay, ſecondly, if he would have been ſo wiſe as to have ſtated it with a judicious moderation thus, *that we may and ought to know that the Holy Ghoſt hath promiſed an aſſiſtance to his Church ſufficient to ſecure it from bringing in any error*, namely, as to deſtroy the foundation, that might have been better endured; but he hath granted that this will not ſerve his purpoſe, as Mr. *Knot* notes, he muſt have the Church ſecure from any error. Theſe Catholicks (as they call themſelves) cannot ſpeake under the forme of univerſality; which is more eaſily contradicted. And we ſuſpend our aſſent untill the demonſtration comes. We *may* not, nor *ought to know* this. We ought not, for we cannot. We cannot but by Scripture. For if they ſay we may know it by the Church, it is the queſtion.

Neither doth he prove our oppoſition of Councils in *their moſt fundamentall ground upon which all Councils hitherto have ſtill ſuppoſed themſelves to ſit as Judges, &c.* Num. 8.

For firſt, it doth not appeare, that all Councils have ſuppoſed themſelves to ſit as Judges, with full

commiſſion to determine ſecurely all controverſies, if the terme [ſecurity] be taken ſecurely from all error. And if they have not ſo defined it, that they do ſo ſit as Judges, or ſit as Judges ſo, how ſhall we, according to my Adverſaries principles, believe it, ſince we are to fetch all truth from the Church in a Council? And ſecondly, if all Councils did eſtabliſh it a Principle, we yet expect a reaſon hereof; ſince neither Pope nor Council have abſolute authority, nor both to together to bind our belief. Yea, thirdly, the Council of *Nice* did ſit upon as good ground as any other Council: but the Council of *Nice* did examine all things by Scripture; ſo in the Hiſtory of the Nicene Council prefixed in a Vatican Edition, it is ſaid, *Rebus itaque in utriuſque partem jactatis, et ad certam Divinarum Scripturarum normam perpenſis communi omnium ſuffragio* Arrius *et* Euſebius *damnantur*. Things being diſcuſſed on both ſides, and weighed and examined according to the certain rule of Divine Scriptures, by common conſent *Arrius* and *Euſebius* are condemned. Therefore are not we to look for a Dictatorian ſentence; but a rationall determination out of Scripture: and if we finde this, this doth oblige *all Chriſtians to conforme to their definitions*. But fourthly, we deny, that we are ſo obliged *by ſuch cenſures as were ſtill held to be ratified in Heaven*. We are not obliged by them neither in themſelves, nor becauſe they were ſo held; nay, alſo we deny that they were ſo held to be ratified in Heaven, unleſſe with this limitation, *clave non errante*. Yea again, theſe do not oblige us to conforme our judgement, their power reſpects the outward act. Yea again, if ſo. *Honorius* was rightly condemned in the ſixth Generall Council, therefore was an Heretick; yea, and Pope *Vigelius* was an errant Heretick for defending the three chap. againſt the

the fifth Councill. And the Romaniſts are bound to think the Condemnation juſt, or the Council to be null. And yet that Council thought it ſelf ſufficient in authority without and againſt the Pope; and therefore they all differed from my Adverſary, who ſaies the Council does not bind without the Popes confirmation.

He ſaies further, *others will tell you divers other opinions you have with Councils.* But if he would have had me anſwer for my ſelf, he muſt have told me the particulars. *Generalia non pungunt*, and they make no action. To diſtinguiſh infallibility from their authority, is no oppoſition, untill infallibility be infallibly made good.

*And even in this place you tell all how little you credit Councils, when you charge them with ſpeaking contradictions.*

*Anſ.* Firſt, credit may be given *in ſenſu diviſo*, to thoſe that may poſſibly ſpeake contradictions; if we meane by credit, a morall reſpect of humane faith: but if he meanes credit of faith Divine, I then grant it, that ſuch credit is not to be given to them which may ſpeake contradictions; for how are they then infallible, as they muſt be by my Adverſary, if they ground faith? As was ſaid of the Miliſians, *Non ſunt ſtulti, ſed poſſunt ſtulta facere*; they are not fools, and yet can do fooliſh things: ſo a Councill may be wiſe, and yet may ſpeake fooliſh things: and I may give ſome credit to them in generall for their wiſedome; though it be poſſible for them to ſay that which includes a contradiction. Secondly, I may charge Councils with contradictions to one another, though not to themſelves. For thirdly, I can charge the Council of Trent with contradictions to it ſelf: and the Trent Council was a generall Councill, in the opinion of my Adverſary; therefore that

grace

grace is voluntarily received, is their opinion; and that yet we cannot know whether we are in ſtate of grace, includes a contradiction; as if we did not know our own will, what it does. This abſurdity was urged by *Catharinus* in the Trent Council. Again (not to ſpeak of ſome of them who had voted the Edition vulgar to be authentick, and yet did except againſt the interpretation of the word ἱλασμὸς, for ſin pardoned, in the Hiſtory of the Council. p. 207) there is a contradiction noted by the German Divines in the ſixth ſeſſion, the ſeventh ch. Where it is ſaid of juſtice, which every one receives according to his meaſure, *quam Spiritus Sanctus partitur ſingulis prout vult, et ſecundum propriam cujuſque diſpoſitionem et cooperationem: Which the Holy Ghoſt doth impart as he will, and according to every ones diſpoſition and cooperation.*

If according to his will, then not according to our diſpoſition; for then it is not, as he will. And ſo in the thirteenth ſeſſion, in the firſt ch. it is ſaid of the manner of Chriſt's exiſtence in the Sacrament, *quam etſi verbis exprimere vix poſſumus*; which although we can ſcarce expreſſe in words, and yet in the fourth ch. it is called of the Holy Catholick Church, Tranſubſtantiation *convenienter et proprie*, appoſitly and properly. And in the ſecond Canon of the ſame ſeſſion, it ſaith of Tranſubſtantiation, *quam quidem converſionem Catholica Eccleſia aptiſſime Tranſubſtantiationem apellat*; which the Catholick Church cals moſt fitly Tranſubſtantiation. Was the Council of Trent infallibly aſſiſted, or aſſiſted with infallibility in theſe contradictions? and yet it may be theſe not all.

Num. 9. But number the ninth will make an end of our cauſe, if a *Rodomontado* of my Adverſary could do the deed. Thus, *And when you ask again, why you*

*you are charged as if you were oppoſed to the true Catholick Church? I anſwer, Chriſt had in all ages a true Catholick Church, and conſequently he had ſuch a Church when your Reformation, as you call it, began. But at this your Reformation you did oppoſe in very many and important points of Doctrine not onely the Roman, but all other Churches upon earth. Therefore without doubt you oppoſed the truly Catholick Church in very many and important points. And in plain Engliſh I tell you, this Argument which is in lawfull form is unanſwerable.*

*Anſ.* So then. But is this *Achilles?* Is this Ἐγκῶ Ἀχιλλεύς? Alas, if we come near him, it is but bombaſt. Firſt, we deny it in the lawfulneſſe of the forme, which he aſſerts; for it is concluding in the ſecond figure affirmatively, and in this regard onely it is *unanſwerable:* for it is not to be anſwered, for want of forme. But yet ſecondly, leſt they ſhould think it is unanſwerable in the matter, we anſwer to the *major* firſt, by diſtinguiſhing; if he takes the true Catholick Church, as in the Apoſtles Creed, he commits an equivocation; for ſo it cannot be taken in the *minor*; becauſe we have in the *minor* the *Roman Church* and *other Churches*, now the Roman is a viſible Church, he means, and ſo he means the *other Churches* to be viſible; for we cannot properly oppoſe, he will think, any but viſible Churches: but in the Creed is meant the Church inviſible, which is the object of faith. If he takes it for the true Catholick Church viſible, as always perſpicuous and flouriſhing in viſibility in all the parts of it, it is denied that the Church Catholick is ſo viſible, and therefore we deny the *major*; and need not ſay any thing to the *minor*; and yet alſo we deny the *minor*, becauſe, if it were not ſo viſible, we could not be ſaid to oppoſe it. And he cannot prove that we oppoſed all other Churches

Churches; becauſe they were not in his ſenſe, viſible, and therefore how can he ſay, that we oppoſed all other Churches, ſince, if they were viſible in the parts to ſome that were Neighbors, yet not viſible to the world generally? Was the Church leſſe the Church in the Primitive times, when it wanted candles to be ſeen in the night? or the ſeven thouſand, which *Elijah* did not know of, leſſe belonging to the Church of the Jews, becauſe they did not openly profeſſe the true Religion? How then can it be ſaid rationally, that we oppoſed all Churches; for how could he or any one man under Heaven know all the Churches of the world then? Yea, thirdly, *in* how *many and important points* did the Reformers oppoſe the Greek Church; and the *Waldenſes*, who as the Author of the Hiſtory of the Trent Council ſayes, had forſaken the Church of *Rome* then four hundred years before, in his fifth book. Yea, fourthly, the *major* propoſition ſuppoſeth for all times and places: doth it not? for ſo the Catholick Church is properly taken, as including all times and places: and ſo we deny the *minor*: we did not oppoſe all Churches of all times. *Dato non conceſſo*, that we did at the Reformation oppoſe *not onely the Roman, but all other Churches*, yet did we not oppoſe all Churches, or the Roman of the Primitive times: and therefore did we not oppoſe the Catholick Church. Yea, yet fifthly, we diſtinguiſh diſſent from oppoſition. Although oppoſition includes a difference, yet every difference doth not include an oppoſition, for then St. *Cyprian* had oppoſed the Church in differing from it upon the point of Rebaptization. And if it be ſaid that the point of Rebaptization was not then defined by the Church: we ſay, that yet this conſideration doth not make every difference to have in it the nature of

oppo-

opposition; for then, though St. *Cyprian* had not opposed the authority of a Church in a Council, yet had he opposed the authoritie of the Church; which then did bind him more than the Trent Council doth us. And that St. *Cyprian* did so oppose the Church, was not then held by the Church Catholick. Sixthly, to return the Argument upon them. *Christ had in all ages a true Catholick Church, and consequently, he had such a Church when* their deformation went on in the Trent Council; but they then in *very many and important points of Doctrine* did oppose all true Catholicks; *therefore without doubt* they *opposed the* truly *Catholick Church in very many and important points*; as in communion under one kind; in Transubstantiation; in Purgatorie; in the merit of works; in seven Sacraments of proper name; in invocation and religious worship of the Saints; in Images. Yea, the Roman Church hath more formally opposed the whole Church; because in the Trent Council it would have the Roman Church to be the Catholick; which supposeth that all Christians must strike sail to them, or else they are sunke. Seventhly, we tell him wherein the Romanist hath divided from the whole Church; but he doth not tell us particularly in what points we have divided from all Churches. Indeed it is the safest way not to come to particulars, for fear of discovery. *In generalibus latet tutus.*

But let us come up closely to him. Either the Fathers of the Primitive Church are on my Adversary's side in the points of difference, or our's; or have not expressed themselves sufficiently on either part: but the Fathers of the Primitive times are not on my Adversary's side. For there was none of those points which we have named held by them: and my Adversary did know that some of ours have con-

fronted *Campion's* challenge about the Fathers, with another challenge to the Romaniſts, to ſhew ſo much as one Father, one Doctor in the Primitive times that hath expreſſed himſelf for them in the points of difference. Then if they have expreſſed themſelves, (and if not, we have not oppoſed them) they are on our ſide; becauſe we are upon contradictions. Thus we ſee what is become of his *unanſwerable Argument*. We ſee that we can differ from them without oppoſition to the Catholick Church, better then they can differ from us without oppoſition to the Catholick Church: becauſe we in our difference from them have kept the Catholick faith, which they have warped from. And ſo that which is left behind in the number, will never come up to fight us to any purpoſe. For as for the Reformers oppoſing the Church, becauſe they cenſured that which was propoſed by the Papiſts, *as oppoſite to the word of God*, we take our Reformation from Scripture; and alſo we ſay, it is not neceſſary in points of difference to conclude, that what is by them urged, *is oppoſite to the word of God*. For it is enough to us to differ upon the negative to the word of God; ſince our principle is, that the Scripture is a ſufficient rule of faith and practiſe. And therefore though a point propoſed doth not oppoſe Scripture, as not being contradictory; yet we reject it from being any Article of faith, becauſe it is not contained in Scripture: And thus, the negative authority of Scripture doth ſufficiently conclude againſt any other article of faith than what is in it.

And as for our not naming *in this whole age, one age in this laſt thouſand years, wherein Chriſt had a truly Catholick Church, agreeing with you in thoſe many and moſt important points, wherein your Reformers*

*mers taxed us to have oppoſed the Scriptures*; This in effect hath been anſwered before; and hath not any thing materially new. But firſt, this is always an unreaſonable demand; which goes upon a certain preſumption of the Romaniſt, that the true Church muſt be alwaies conſpicuouſly viſible; which is to be denied, and therefore it doth not follow, that becauſe we cannot name any Church agreeing with us, therefore there was none. Secondly, if he means by a truly Catholick Church, one particular Church of the Catholick, thoſe whom we have named did not agree with them in the moſt important points of difference, (as not in point of Diſcipline) nay, they have differed from them, and therefore have agreed with us in the queſtions betwixt us. And beſides, if they meane a truely Catholick Church in this ſenſe, as a part of the whole; then a particular Church it ſeems may be a Catholick, and a truely Catholick Church: and therefore have they no reaſon to vaunt of the title of Catholick given by the Antients to the Church or Biſhop of *Rome*; becauſe other Churches may alſo be Catholick: and why then ſhould the Pope uſurp the title of univerſall Biſhop over a particular Church? And if he means by *a truely Catholick Church*, the Catholick Church properly, then he doth imply a contradiction, that the Catholick Church, which includes all ages, ſhould be limited to a thouſand yeares. But thirdly, he did wiſely ſtint the queſtion for this thouſand yeares, ſince he could not well go further, for the ſix hundred years before do ſhew no diſagreement to us in the moſt important points of difference. And let them aſſure themſelves, that our agreement with the ſix hundred of the Primitive Church is more available for our defence, than the ſuppoſed diſagreement with the thouſand years after is available to the accuſation.

Fourthly, ſuppoſe no one Church could be named correſponding with us in moſt important points, for this thouſand yeares; yet even in every age of the thouſand yeares there might be (and ſome have) named ſeverall perſons which have held the materiall points of difference betwixt us; and ſeverall of the Roman Communion have bore teſtimony to the truth; yea, even in the Trent Council; in ſo much that they have been complained of for bending to Proteſtantiſme; as may be ſeen through the Hiſtory of that Council. Fifthly, what Tyranny is this, to ſtifle and ſmother by their domination all other Churches, as much as they could, which were not of their faith, and then challenge us to ſhew what Church agreed with us? Sixthly, *Omne reducitur ad principium*, as *Aquinas*'s rule is, then we are to take a true Church from trial of Scripture: and we put it to this iſſue; All Catholick Churches agree with Scripture in the moſt important points of difference: we agree with Scripture, or Scripture with us in theſe points; therefore we agree with all Catholick Churches in theſe points; becauſe we agree *in tertio*. Therefore if the Romaniſts differ, let them look to it. We differ from none but them in thoſe points: and that we differ from them is their fault, and our ſecurity. If they had not left the Catholick, to be a ſingular Plenipotentiarie; we had not left Communion with them as a part of the whole; or rather they had not left our Communion. *Delictum ambulat cum Capite.*

And as for that he ſays, *And as for externall diviſion, you cannot name the Church upon earth from which you did not divide your ſelves at your Reformation.* We return it with the neceſſary changes; nor can they at their Deformation *name the Church upon earth from which* they *did not divide themſelves.*

*And*

*And I challenge them to tell me, if* they *can, to what Church on earth then visible* they *did joine themselves, or who acknowledged to be of their Communion?*

But first, as for external Communion, we say moreover, first, we divided not first Communion, but the Pope, when, in the time of Queen *Elizabeth*, he sent a Bill to prohibit his Subjects Communion with us. 2. We divided not from their Church simply, but so as corrupted and engaging us, upon communion with them to error and bad practise. We left the house as infected, with a mind of returning when it shall be clear and safe for us. Thirdly as before, we divided not from the Primitive times in point of Doctrine or Discipline: now then, suppose there was not at the Reformation any other Church unto which we might joine; which is more agreable to the duty and honor of a Church, to joine with a corrupt Church in Doctrine and practise, or to leave their communion externall and to follow the Primitive? If the person be to be esteemed by the Doctrine, not the Doctrine by the person, as *Tertullian's* rule is in his *Præscrip.* Then we may leave fellowship of persons for affinity with better Doctrine, if by the communion with the persons, we must also espouse the errours. Fourthly, as they have sunke their Patriarcate, and have arrogated an universallity of domination (and so have divided from all the world, that they might reigne over all) so we have resumed our antient libertie of the British Church to subsist independently from them. Yea, this was acknowledged in effect by *Urban*, when he called for *Anselme* in the Council at a plunge, *Includamus hunc in orbe nostro tanquam alterius orbis Papam.* And therefore, as to Communion upon subjections we are not bound; and as to fra-

fraternall Communion we are ready in mind, with any who are, or when they ſhall be found; ſince all the ſeparation which was made by us, (if any made) was in our own defence. Fifthly, if *Spalatenſis* and *Eraſmus* were able to judge, many would have been of our Communion, durſt they have been like thoſe whom St. *Cyprian* ſpeaks of, who were unconquerable; becauſe they did not fear to die. And therefore, as *Juſtin Martyr* ſaid of *Plato*, that he would as plainly have ſpoken for one God as *Socrates*, but that he was afraid of *Socrates's* death; ſo that he obſcured his paſſages of Divinity, with other paſſages which did differ: ſo would many (beſides thoſe in the Trent Council) have ſpoken more freely for the Proteſtants, but for the Inquiſition: and this hath made them blende good paſſages for us with ſome appearances againſt us. So then ſince we communicate with the firſt four Generall Councils in Doctrine, and with the Primitive times alſo in Diſcipline, this *externall diviſion* from you makes the quarrell; but as the caſe ſtood, no guilt; and therefore no danger. The Catholick Church hath the greateſt promiſes; the Roman Church is not the Catholick Church. So then we may do well without their Communion, if we pray for them.

Num. 10. In the tenth number, he would winde himſelf off from the inconveniency of his own principle in the fourth page of the Treatiſe, *True it is to ſubmit exteriourly to temporall judges, they being able, and only to judge of the exteriour man; but God who ſearcheth the reins and the heart, and who looketh moſt upon the mind (which is the ſeate of true or falſe belief) doth chiefly exact that thoſe of his Church be of one faith interiourly, or elſe they are not of one faith: for faith eſſentially conſiſteth in the interiour judgement, &c.* Upon which words I did argue thus: *We*

*are*

*are bound to ſubmit our judgement onely to thoſe who can judge of the inward act. But God onely can judge our internall acts; therefore we muſt ſubmit our aſſents onely to him; and therefore to others no further than they ſpeake according to him: ſo that we cannot abſolutely adhere to whatſoever is ſaid in Councils, which have erred, Jewiſh and Chriſtian too.*

And now he ſaies, *I never ſaid any ſuch thing.* He means, namely, that Councils cannot judge of the interiour act. Nor do I ſay, that he did ſay ſo. But I took his principle, *That God onely ſearcheth the heart and reins, and looketh upon the mind, and exacteth that thoſe of his Church be of one judgement interiourly*, for my diſcourſe. The Argument is out of its own poſition. And now, (if there had been need of his confeſſion) he hath acknowledged the Aſſumption, that God onely can judge of the internall act: for he denies this ability to Councils. And therefore it doth appear, that he is ſnarled: and that Councils cannot binde the internall act, becauſe they cannot judge thereof.

But now therefore he would evade thus. *But God (in whoſe name the Church teacheth and commandeth all which ſhe teacheth and commandeth) ſearcheth the heart and the reins.* What then? Becauſe they teach and command in God's name, therefore have they God's omniſcience? If the Divine nature of Chriſt did not transfuſe by communication of Ideoms a reall propertie to the humane nature, of the Divine; ſhall they thinke to makes God's Court, which immediately obligeth in Conſcience, to be theirs? They make God and the Council all one. As they have given to the Pope Chriſt's Chaire: ſo they will give to the Council God's Tribunall. Whatſoever is taught in Gods name hath not always for it,

ſic

*ſic dicit Dominus*, God's word pierceth the heart, as before, but every thing which is taught under God's name is not according to his word, as traditions. This is juſt ſuch an Argument as that of the Pontificians to prove, that the Saints in Heaven ſee all things, becauſe they ſee him who ſees all things: Yes, and he that ſearcheth the hearts giveth them his authority, therefore they can binde in the intetiour act. Hath he given them this authority? Hath he given them this power? if they affirme it, it is high Blaſphemy. If they deny it, the Argument of my Adverſary to excuſe himſelf, is a nullitie. And my Argument is yet good againſt them, ſince his is no better than if I ſhould ſay, becauſe they ſee one who ſees nothing, they ſee nothing. And therefore this did fully abſolve the ſubſtance of the fourth page, or diſſolve it; the Council may be aſſiſted and yet not with omniſcience, nor infallibility.

Num. 11. And therefore hath he no cauſe to ſay to me, *but you skip to my admiration of your Doctrine.* Let the judicious Reader judge which have ſkipped moſt; he that anſwereth punctually, or he that gives a treatiſe for an anſwer. I urged him preſſely; and he anſwered me not ſo much as *coldly*, not at all. This was one ſkip for all.

And then he goes on with repetitions of our Doctrine, and of his refutations of it before with references to the fourth chap. And then he tels me what ſhall be done in the next. But I ſhould not hear of it untill it be done. *Laudari non poteſt niſi peractum*, Ἀμ' ἔπος ἄμ' ἔργον. this might have been ſkipped.

Then he comes to ſay ſomewhat of St. *Athanaſius. As for St. Athanaſius, did ever he oppoſe his judgement againſt the definitions of a lawfull Generall*

*rall Councill? Nay, did it not appeare by the Council of Nice, ſtanding for his Doctrine, that he might well know, the true Church, lawfully aſſembled under the lawfull Paſtor, confirming their acts, would teach as he did.*

*Anſ.* Firſt, the whole argument is drawn but *a ſingulari*, and this will not conclude, if he did not oppoſe. Secondly, if it did conclude, it would not be contradictory; for we do not maintain oppoſition. Thirdly, though he did not oppoſe the Synod of Nice, yet doth it not follow preſently, that he did not oppoſe it by reaſon of an infallibility, but becauſe it was not deceived, as ruling it ſelf by the word of God. Fourthly, St. *Athanaſius* had the ſame opinion againſt the multitude, which the Nicene Councel had, before the Council or after. If before alſo, then we ſee that one man is not to be controlled by a multitude; and therefore why are we upbraided in our Religion with the paucity of the Profeſſors? If after, then we ſee that a Council is not an effectuall meanes to put an end to all Controverſies. Fifthly, he doth not adviſedly put in theſe words, *the lawfull Paſtor confirming their Acts.* This is not diſcreetly applied to the Councel of Nice; for, as to this, he was firſt deceived, in thinking we would ſwallow his ſuppoſition of *the lawfull Paſtor* in his ſenſe of univerſality and ſingularity. We deny the Pope to be the lawfull Paſtor. Secondly, *Liberius* did ſubſcribe S. *Athanaſius's* baniſhment: and how ſhall we then take the confirmation of a Council from a Pope, when he ſubſcribes againſt it? Thirdly, the Nicene Councel was not confirmed by the Biſhop of *Rome* more than by ſome other Biſhop. Yea, as it was called By the Emperor *Conſtantine*, ſo was it confirmed

by him. And therefore by my Aduerſaries principles, The authority of the Nicene Council ſhould be but humane, becauſe it had not its *eſſe formale* by the Pope. Yea, ſixthly, neither is it neceſſary, that after the Nicene Council he ſhould *oppoſe a greater humane authority* upon the authority of the Council, as if it had been more than humane: for he oppoſed the greater part before. Seventhly, he did not well conſider what he ſaid; for if he might oppoſe (upon his ſuppoſition) a greater humane authority; then, untill they prove the authority of a Council to be Divine, ſo as infallibly aſſiſted with infallibility, there may be a greater authority than of the Nicene Council; which is not true notwithſtanding. And if he meant ſo, he opppſed a Generall Council more than I.

In the following words of this number, I was glad to finde him ſo ſoberly defending the title of Roman Catholicks. He ſaies, *To avoid this very ſtrife, impertinent now to our purpoſe, I uſed that very name by which no others are exeluded.*

This is ingeniouſly ſaid, but he knew that the Romaniſts are wont to uſurp this title. And I had good reaſon to take good notice of it, leſt my ſilence ſhould be miſ-interpreted. For ſome are wont to take advantage at what is ſaid, and alſo at what is not ſaid. But indeed doth he give up the title to the uſe of others alſo as not excluſive to them, neither in comprehenſion, (which would make a contradiction) nor in juriſdiction; then why doe men contend ſo much for the Roman Church, as Mother and Miſtriſſe of all Churches? Why is added in their Creed to the Catholick Church the Roman? Why in the Trent Council was none accounted Catholicks but them? Indeed

alſo

alſo this is the wiſeſt courſe, if the knot cannot be untied, to cut it off: ſo he, to avoide the proof of the appropriation of the title to them, hath denied the appropriation. But this confeſſion I ſuppoſe the Prieſts of *Rome* would not well accept; for in very deed it goes near to the ruining of the cauſe. And this plainly contradicts himſelf in his own principles, thus; the Catholick Church is infallible: ſo he ſays ſtill. The Roman Church is onely infallible. So he ſaid in the end of the former Treatiſe; then the Roman Church is onely Catholick. Now he ſays he did not exclude other Churches: and yet no Church Catholick but the Roman.

*And in this impertinent ſtiffe you ſay many things, of which you prove not one.* If ſuch a put-off might be allowed to me, I might ſoon have done. I need not ſay much to what is ſaid, becauſe ſo little is ſaid to any purpoſe. But he knew he was pinched by mention of the falſification of the Nicene Council about the ſuperiority of the Biſhop of *Rome*, and ſeverall other particulars, which needed no proof to an intelligent man, let the world judge, whether if any thing could be excepted againſt what I ſaid ſolidly, my Adverſary would have forborne the offering of it to conſideration. And alſo to my former vindication of our Doctrine about the authority of Councils, which had four anſwers, he replies nothing but that of *Athanaſius*, which might more happily have been left out.

In the twelfth number he would refute me by noting a *dangerous conſequence flowing from the premiſſes of our Doctrine*, his diſcourſe is reſolved into this Syllogiſme, *Texts of Scripture* are not Num. 12.

*able to decide all neceſſary controverſies (unleſſe as they ſend us to the Church) by themſelves, as I ſhall ſhew in my next ch.* But I hold texts of Scripture onely infallible. Therefore we ſhall never have an end of Controverſies, unleſſe we underſtand the texts of Scripture (which ſpeake of Chriſt's promiſes to the Church) of aſſiſtance infallible: as St. *Math.* 28. *ult.* and others which we ſhall have an account of in the next ch. This is the ſum of his ratiocination.

*Anſ.* We ſhall ſhew the civility not to prevent the uſe and buſineſſe of the next ch. but this reaſoning will be valid no where; it will not grow ſtronger by the next age. Therefore we ſay (not to repeat repetitions) that, as to the *major* propoſition, we deny it upon our account of all neceſſary Coutroverſies, although not upon his account. All things plainly neceſſary are ſo laid down in Scripture, as there needs be no controverſie thereabouts. In things of queſtion ſimple error doth not damn. But thoſe who make no difference of belief by reſpect to object or uſe, but do take all upon the propoſall of the Church, are apt to enlarge the number of things neceſſary, becauſe, all upon that account are with equall neceſſity to be received. And yet, as hath been noted, they have no reaſon to multiply the number of neceſſary Controverſies; for with them there is no neceſſity of believing any thing but this, that the Church is infallible. But then ſecondly, as to the *major*, if he meane *by themſelves* ſo as the Scriptures ſhould formally decide Controverſies, he fights with his own ſhadow: for it doth not contradict, when we do not affirme: we ſay not that formally any Controverſie is decided by texts of Scripture, but that in things plain there is no neceſſi-

ceſſity of any ſuch deciſion; and in many Controverſies the Scripture doth as well in the principles decide it, as the Law doth differences civil. If he meanes *by themſelves* therefore ſo, as that they do not decide them without ſending us *to the Church*; we anſwer by diſtinguiſhing, that firſt in things plaine there is no need of the judgement of the Church. In things of Controverſie there is need of the Church; but not need of infallible determination. There is an ending of Controverſies ſpeculatively, when the judgement is reſolved by infallible Scripture: there is an ending of Controverſies practically, by authority of the Church, ſo as to binde the perſon againſt diſturbance. Now the queſtion betwixt us is of the former ending of Controverſies which cannot be performed by the Church. And dare any man that ſoberly reads all the Hiſtory of the Councill of Trent, and obſerveth ſo long deliberations, ſo many interpoſals, ſo hot diſputes, ſuch changes, ſo many notable Contradictions of many of them, ſay, that all Controverſies were there infallibly ended? As *Tertullian* to the Heathens, *appello Conſcientiam veſtram*; I appeale unto their Conſciences when they are preparing for death, whether Cardinall, or Canoniſt, or Pope dare affirme it. This for the *major*.

As to the aſſumption, I alſo may diſtinguiſh, if he takes texts of Scripture as principles in order to Coucluſions, I hold them onely infallible. If he takes texts of Scripture, as in terms, excluſively to Concluſions immediate, ſo I do not hold them onely infallible, but alſo the Concluſions which do naturally deſcend by prime reſultance from them. Now a Council may apply principles of Scripture which may reſolve a queſtion unto faith.

faith; but this is not done always and absolutely: and when it is done, it is done by vertue of Scripture. They do not determine things by Divine inspiration, but by humane disquisition, as was distinguished in the Trent Council; and therefore may they misse possibly in their discourse. Yea, to the assumption I also say, though I hold texts of Scripture onely infallible; yet I onely do not hold them so; but the Fathers, as before; the Nicene Doctors, as before; yea, and some in the Trent Councill too, as we have noted. And again, if any thing else be infallible, then a Council; if a Council, then according to them, the Council of Trent; if the Council of Trent, why did they not determine of Bishops whether they were *jure Divino* or not? and why did they not determine of Residence, whether *jure Divino* or not? If they could not, how were they infallible? If they would not, how were they faithfull? Again, If you be *necessitated*, as you say, to extend the texts of Christs assistance to his Church unto infallibility, for the ending of controversies, otherwise *we shall remaine disputing without end, or possibility of end*, and onely for this, as he seems to meane, then there is no necessity at all. And the consequence is cleare (without his *absurdity*) upon the former distinction; because plain things need not come into question; and points of question need not an infallible decision.

Num. 13. In the thirteenth number I have two things chiefly to consider; first, his charge of impertinency in my declaring the difficulty of assent by the unanimous consent *of all the Fathers of all ages every where*. Secondly, I am to consider his Apology for waving the authority of the Fathers in this debate. He asks me as to the first *What connexion*

*nexion hath the perusall of every judgment of every Father of every age every where with that obligation which I put of following these Canons of Councils, which make to the decision of those most known Controversies about which we contend.*

*Ans.* First, there is a connexion of this discourse with the ground of that about which we are conversant, namely, the authority of the Church. For what authority can they produce for the distinction of the Church from no Church in any profession, or from a false Church, but the unanimous consent of the Fathers of the Church? What Council did make themselves by their own authority to be indeed Christians? the first Councils were not antecedent to Christianity, but Christianity to them. So then either the Church is distinguished by the consent of the Fathers, or by Scripture. If by Scripture, then is it the first principle and the last: and *a primo ad ultimum*, we have no more dependence upon the Church than from Scripture. If by the consent of the Fathers, then I spake before to good purpose, though my Adversary said, it *was nothing to our purpose*. For the Councils we must be ruled by absolutely, as he supposeth, are the Councils of the Church, are they not? well then, if the Church be distinguished by the unanimous consent of the Fathers, (which I suppose they will not deny) then the discourse about the consent of the Fathers was not eccentricall to the point in hand. Let them remember the rule of Aquinas, *Omne reducitur ad principium*. Secondly, it beares connexion with the question about Councils *per modum regulæ*, as the rule by which they goe in their definitions. Either they went by Scripture, or by the consent of the Fathers. If they went by Scripture, then by my Adversaries opinion we must

muſt goe that way: becauſe we are to be infallibly directed by them. If by the joint conſent of the Fathers, then ſurely our diſcourſe was very proper and pertinent: or if they will not have the Fathers conſent to be conſidered ſo much as contradiſtinguiſhed unto Scripture (becauſe as the Legates and Preſidents of the Trent Council ſaid, *the holy Fathers have no other grounds but Scripture*) yet the conſent of the Fathers is diſtinguiſhed from the object upon which their conſent is terminated. So then, as for the ſenſe of Scripture, either the Councils went by the rule of the Father's joint interpretation or not: if by it, then we have our purpoſe of defending the reaſonableneſſe of our ſpeech about the Fathers. If not, then by the common rules of underſtanding the ſenſe of Scripture, and then why ſhould we not goe that way for our reſolution which they go.

So that my Adverſary needed not to have given me an admonition of *holding cloſe to the matter*. And yet I take that admonition very kindely, that my Adverſaries might be obedient to their own law.

That which he ſaies, *Is the judgement of every Father of every age the judgement of a Generall Council?* is nothing. For though it be not the judgement of the Councill *in recto*; yet I hope, it was *in cauſa*; not that they were determined by the judgement of one ſeparately from the reſt, but becauſe it is ſuppoſed by my Adverſaries, that they all agreed. If they ſay they did not, then let my Adverſaries agree it as well as they can with the reſt of their Church, who ſtand as much for our obedience to them, as to any other authority of the Church. And whether they hold the Fathers as Judges or as witneſſes, it is all one to me; becauſe

cauſe I ſpeak of their authority in general. So then, if the judgement of every Father of every age disjunctively or distributively be not the judgement of a general Council (which my Antagonists think unreasonable) yet conjunctively and complexively, I hope it is, or should be, according to their common principles. And if they lie at catch upon the ambiguity of the termes *of every Father of every age*, they commit a plain fallacy, in distribution and also are peccant in the ignorance of the *Elench*, for if they meane every Father of every age distributively, it doth not contradict me who speake of them in consent.

And now shall I come to the second taske, to hunt out the reason why he would not deale with me in this Controversie by the authority of the Fathers. He saies thus.

*Since you bring the authority of Councils to a little more than nothing, and again the authority of the Fathers to a little lesse than nothing, in order to the ending of Controversies, this your violence against any provocation to antiquity and consent to Fathers will give me leave to make this Treatise much shorter than at the begining appeared possible; for it is evident out of your own words, that it is to no end to deale with you out of Fathers: and I am resolved to deale with no body but to some end. I will therefore humor you in this: and I will lay aside all that might hereafter be said concerning the opinion of Fathers.*

*Anſ. Nimia perfectio parit ſuſpicionem.* My Adversary is so curious in this apology of his, that he is to be suspected. I gave no such occasion, but he takes it against the use of the Fathers in this point. I am not guilty, in any sober mans judgement, of any privative disrepect unto them. I do not bring

*the authority of the Fathers be a little losse than nothing*: what is due justly either to Councils or to Fathers I do willingly give. But because infallibility is not granted, therefore am I charged with disrespect. This is a fallacie δευτερου. He that denies them this doth not deny unto them such reverence as is equal. And for the Fathers, I have not waved any testimony which hath been produced against our cause; I have not said, as he,

Ἡμεῖς τῶν πατέρων μὴ ἀμφιβαίνομεν ἐν τοῖς ἐγχωμίοις ἕπεσθαι.

Yea, I have used the same Argument against my Adversaries *in triumphum*. Again, Οὐ καλὸν ἐναντία λέγειν τῷ Θεῷ ἢ τῷ Πατρὶ ἢ τῷ Διδασκάλῳ, as he in his Rhetorick: but I have said nothing which is not conformable to the word of God, to the consent of the Fathers and of the Doctors of the Church: but because I will not make the word of the Fathers and of the Doctors equall to the infallible word of God, therefore am I not reasonably accused of slighting the Fathers and Doctors of the antient Church. But this was necessary for my Adversary, to colour his refusall of answering to those Fathers I brought against him, and to the answers which I gave to the testimonies of the Fathers which he brought against me. So difficulty is sometimes by Sophisters construed for impertinency. By this Argument I must say nothing proper but what may be easily answered. But it had been more ingenuous, first, to have exhibited solid authorities out of the Fathers of the Primitive antiquity; or at least to have given a sufficient answer to my refutation of what use he made of those he quoted against me; and then to have laid aside the urging of the Fathers upon my account of Refusall of them onely as infallible Judges. To gather up then my exceptions against this part of his apologie; I say first, I do not either

ther in terms, or by consequence, bring *Councils to a little more than nothing, nor the authority of the Fathers to little lesse than nothing, in order to the ending of Controversies.* I allow them to be of great use in his terms, *in order* to the ending of Controversies. There may be an ordinability of them towards, or in order, to this end, without infallibility in them: they may finde out and give us the infallible sense of Scripture; but we cannot take it so upon their word: their authority is moving but not cogent of our assent. Secondly, I except against those words wherein he imputes to me a *violence against any provocation to antiquity and consent to Fathers.*

This I deny. Neither in termes nor by discourse can they finde such words or sense from me. I have used their own weapon against them. I have answered their objections from them. I renew the provocation and challenge which Bishop *Jewell* and others of our Divines have made to them, to shew, if they can, any notable part, yea, any two, yea, any one of the ancient Fathers that clearly and constantly hath professed the points wherein we differ from them. And if the Fathers had been for them, why did they corrupt some passages of the Fathers which spoke against them; which they have not yet cleared themselves of? Yea, thirdly, whereas he says *my* refusall of the Fathers *will give him leave to make this Treatise much shorter than at the beginning*; I say (not insisting here upon the impropriety of a Treatise, if it be no more as to my satisfaction: or of the terme, if it be more) that there had been rome enough for all the Fathers authorities he could produce for himself, and also for all that he could say to my answers about their testimonies, without

making his Treatise so long, if he had left out impertinences, and references, and repetitions.

Therefore hath my Adversary taken more liberty than I afforded him in his refusall of dealing with the Fathers: yet not more liberty than was necessary for him, lest he should be in necessity to answer what answers I made to his former testimonies of them; and also to what testimonies I have produced against him.

And I finde him wary lest I should make this advantage of his resolution to wave the Fathers. He would make it to be no design but a rationall purpose, therefore he goes on:

*But doe not think that I doe this, as if what you here said against the authority of the Fathers found any credit with me, or as if what you say were in the least degree hard to be answered, for you your-self cannot be ignorant that we alleadge plenty of the Fathers against you, as are confessed by your selves to have been the prime Doctors of the Primitive Church.*

*Ans.* The rule is good, μὴ μανεὶς ἀπόκτεινον. And surely he is not damned that doth not believe, that all which is said by men on their own behalf is true. But secondly, they do not produce many testimonies of *the prime Doctors of the Primitive Church*; namely, not of the first 300 years; nay, nor of the first 600 years: others are Postnates and have not the honor of Primitive Antiquity. Yea, some they name as testimonies for them were not Fathers. And some works they cite for them which are falsely ascribed to true Fathers, as several of our Writers have demonstrated, even with the Confession of some of their Church. Thirdly, whereas he saies [*Do not think that I do this as if what you have said against the authority of the Fathers found any credit with me*] he

he wrongs me with a fallacie διὰ τί πρὸ τί πῶς, if he would have men believe that I ſpake againſt the authority of the Fathers ſimply, becauſe I ſpake againſt their authority as abſolutely convictive of the underſtanding in point of truth. And alſo, whereas he ſaies it did not find credit with him, I am of his opinion: for certainly little is like to be believed by the Pontificians that is againſt them. But after this manner his Treatiſe might ſoon be anſwered; it finds not credit with me. One blot would ſerve for all the Treatiſe. Fourthly, what reaſon may this be called, the Pontificians uſe plenty of the Fathers againſt us; therefore he will not anſwer to my teſtimonies from them, nor to my anſwers to his teſtimonies againſt us. Doe any of thoſe Pontificians fully anſwer my teſtimonies, and doe they ſufficiently take off my anſwers? If they doe, he ſhould have told me which, and where. But were I as apt to brag as the Romans are I might not be far from crying *victoria*, that I ſhould ſtand to anſwer the Fathers and bring them to ſtand for us (though my Adverſary ſaies, I *bring them to leſſe than nothing*) and yet he that makes ſo much of them in ſhew, ſhould detrect this way of plea by them.

*Whereas their ſmall errors uſed preſently to be diſcovered and cryed down.* This is not altogether true. For how many of their errors continued long: yea, great errors alſo, as the Millenarie opinion? And Infant Communion was not preſently decreed neither. Therefore yet it remaines to be proved, that any of the points of difference betwixt the Papiſts and us was a ſtanding opinion of the Primitive times, which my Adverſary would inſinuate: וכו׳ וכו׳ וכו׳.

*And it would make a learned man amazed to aſk*

*as you do, how few of them have touched upon our differences.*

*Anſ.* There is no ſuch cauſe of Amazement. Learned men in generall wonder leſſe, and learned men cannot wonder particularly at this, as knowing the reaſon, which was added by me, *having not occaſion by Adverſaries*; and therefore doth my Adverſary wiſely paſſe by any mention of the reaſon, as not being pertinent for his uſe. But alſo was that I ſaid well guarded, firſt, *how few*, I did not ſay none. Secondly, I ſaid touched, namely, as to handle, and this is neceſſary to be believed; becauſe indeed there were few of them Argumentative: then though ſome of them might put out occaſionally ſome expreſſions relating to our differences, yet is not this to touch argumentatively our differences; for, *aliud agentis parva autoritas*, as the rule is. And then thirdly, if many of them at leaſt did not touch, ſo as to handle diſcurſively all our differences, there is no cauſe of admiring my ſpeech; for if they had handled ſome, not all, how ſhould we have been directed in thoſe which they had not handled? Now then let all be conſidered; then upon the whole matter let me ſay this, that if any Pontifician can prove, that many of them did handle argumentatively all the points of debate betwixt us, then I ſhall give leave for the amazement of my expreſſion.

Therefore as to the Authors he produceth of his ſide, who give account of the Fathers in our differences, as *Coccius*, *Gualterus*, the Author of the Progeny of the Catholicks and Proteſtants, or any other named by any other; I ſay this, that he ſhould have told me particulary where each of them doth produce any Father and in what point, and

and alſo ſhould have ſhewed in them, that many Fathers have all conjunctively ſpoken of the ſeverall points; and alſo that they have ſpoken of them directly on purpoſe where the ſeat of the matter was; and alſo, that no where they contradict what in one place they ſaid, or at leaſt, did not elſewhere ſpeak doubtingly: otherwiſe he concludes not any thing of weight againſt me. And then ſecondly, I can returne my Adverſary number for number and weight for weight of our own, who have anſwered all the teſtimonies of the Fathers, which their learned Champions have produced, as Biſhop *Jewell*, Dr. *Whitaker*, Dr. *Reynolds*, (beſides *Chamier* of *France*) who have refuted the inſtances of the Fathers. Yea, the challenge of the firſt of them was never yet well anſwered as to the teſtimony of the Fathers. And thirdly, either the Fathers cannot be brought in with their ſuffrages for them, or they can: if they cannot, why doth *Campian* and others crack and brag of the Fathers? and then alſo my Adverſaries Authors are diſannulled. If they can, then either the Fathers ſpeak contradictions, ſince we produce them as well for us, (and therefore cannot we be ruled by them) or elſe my Adverſary needed not to have ſhifted the anſwering to them, but might have found other paſſages out of them to have commodiouſly reconciled the ſeeming variance. Yea, then either my Adverſary had not ſuch cauſe to reſt infallibity in a Council, if all the Fathers of all ages agreed; or the conſent of the Fathers might be a rule to the Council; and then my diſcourſe of the Fathers had good conjunction with the Controverſie about Councils.

As for the Author of the Progeny of Catholicks and Proteſtants, whom he brings in here, as *handling*

*ling a part all our main differences, and doth in all theſe points give* us *the very words of* our *own chief Doctors clearly acknowledging a great number of holy Fathers directly oppoſit to* us *in each one of theſe points.*

To this I anſwer, that it is poſſible ſome of our Church may not meet with right editions of the Fathers; might not diſcerne their true works; might miſtake the ſenſe and application of ſome words, or not being able dextrouſly to reconcile their expreſſions to ſome other paſſages of the Fathers and to our opinions, might conclude them as oppoſit. If this Argument were good, then are they alſo bound to conclude the Fathers to be on our ſide, becauſe *Bellarmin* produceth in his Diſputations teſtimonies of the Fathers for us. Indeed he endeavours to anſwer thoſe teſtimonies: but I dare affirme, that ſeverall of thoſe teſtimonies which the Author hath produced from our own ſide of the Fathers, may as well be anſwered as ſome of thoſe which *Bellarmin* anſwers. Thirdly, my Adverſaries might have known alſo, that there is a book written by none of ours which is a Confutation of Papiſts by Papiſts: So then, if they will ſet our Divines againſt us, we can ſet their Divines againſt them; yea, alſo in ſeverall points were the teſtimonies of the Primitive Church urged againſt ſome of their points in the Trent Council by ſome of their Church. Fourthly, I have read *Breerley* through (it being commended to me by one who thought, I think, thereby to convince me in the caſe) and I can give no other account than as Mr. *Chillingworth* doth, that he hath not dealt exactly with the Confeſſions of thoſe of our Church, as in the inſtance of ſome paſſages out of Mr. *Hooker*, as may be ſeen in Mr. *Chillingworth*, page

page 62. As alſo in a paſſage of *Luther*, as may be ſeen in Mr. *Chilling*. If the pages 79 and 92 be compared. And therefore have we no reaſon to be concluded againſt upon his word; yea, ſome of the authorities he bringeth do not reſpect the main points betwixt us: and as I remember, ſome authorities are not contradictory to our cauſe, and therefore was I rather confirmed by reading of that book. And therefore *groundleſſe* is my Adverſaries excuſe for not medling with the holy Fathers in this Controverſie betwixt us. Though they did not profeſſedly diſcuſſe and determine our queſtions (and therefore cannot their authority ſo much ſway us) yet their expreſſions for us might weigh with our Adverſaries, who ſo much boaſt of them at leaſt, they might ſay ſomewhat to what anſwers have been made to their quotations of them. And if we muſt not make uſe of them, becauſe we cannot account them infallible, then my Adverſaries diſcourſe might have been alſo well ſpared, for I am ſure his diſcourſe is not infallible.

He having then diſmiſſed the hearing of the Fathers *ſine die*; he comes upon us thus. *And indeed your Doctors would faine diſpute out of Scripture onely.*

*Anſ.* If *onely* be taken in order to the ultimate reſolution of faith, we would indeed diſpute out of Scripture onely; becauſe the Principles of Scripture are onely to us infallible, but if *onely* be taken excluſively to all uſe of the Fathers, we deny it. To ſhew that our Doctrine is truely Divine, we prove it out of Scripture: to ſhew that it is not new, we compare it with the ſayings of the Fathers; yea, the judgement of the Fathers hath it ſelf to faith as a rationall diſpoſitive; but not as an iner-

rable determinative, this Priviledge we reſerve to Scripture, which is to us the formall object and ground of Divine faith. And if they can ſhew us *ſic dicit Dominus*, for abſolute credence to the Church, we have done.

But he gives us his *Criſis* why we would faine diſpute out of Scripture onely. *Becauſe they find it to be true, that the Scriptures alone cannot decide many Controverſies but by ſome Interpretation or other, they think themſelves able to elude the force of Arguments drawn from Scripture onely: the ſayings which are not in Scripture are in no caſe receivable by them.*

*Anſ.* Well gueſſed. Surely we have here a meer Cavill by a *non cauſa*: doe not our Adverſaries think that they are as cunning at interpretations as we? They are wont to brag of the brave Education and Learning: therefore likely they can tell how to elude an Interpretation as well as others, and there were thoſe that told them they did do ſo in the Trent Council.——*Catilina, Cethegum.* And would not our Adverſaries have all the diſpute referred to the Church which they can order as they pleaſe as a Leſbian rule, either corrupting the ſtile or adultering the ſenſe, as *Tertullian* ſaid of the Hereticks then, or prohibiting Authors againſt them to be read? Yea, what debates were there about the ſenſe of the Decrees of the Council of Trent? Yea, ſome decrees were purpoſely put into ſuch termes of ambiguitie, that ſo the mind of the Council might be drawn into different ſenſes according to the pleaſure of the Litigants, as the Author of the Hiſtory relates. Secondly, herein then appears our ingenuity, in that we diſpute with you by that which is capable of other ſenſes: whereas they would have

us

us to be referred to the ſenſe of the Church, which they think cannot be accommodated for us. Thirdly, we do not ſay, that *no ſaying is receivable in any caſe by us but out of Scripture*, but receivable equally upon neceſſity to ſalvation we ſtill deny every ſaying: we receive ſufficiently what is ſaid by the Church in point of Diſcipline: and what is ſaid in point of faith we receive with due reverence; not with abſolute faith.

And certainly we ſeem to give more reſpect to the Church than they do to Scripture, if all of them be like my Adverſary; for ſo he goes on. *Whereas indeed there is no good got by diſputing of texts of Scripture, but either to make men ſick or mad, as our Adverſaries may daily ſee by their fruitleſſe Scripture-Combates with the Anabaptiſts, the Sabbatharians, and other upſtart Sectaries.*

*Anſ. Omne mendacium, quod de Deo dicunt, quodammodo genus eſt Idololatriæ*, as he ſaid in his Preſcriptions: and this which is falſely ſaid of the word of God, is for the Idoll of the Roman Church. The Scripture hath it ſelf to the Church as the Emperor to the Pope in the Roman account: and as the Moon hath it ſelf to the Sun, ſo hath the Emperor himſelf to the Pope; the Moon depends upon the Sun for light, the Emperor upon the Pope for authority; and the Scripture upon the Church for light and authority. But firſt, he argues from the deniall of the act to the deniall of the power; yea, from the deniall of the effect to the deniall of the power; becauſe there is no *good got by diſputing of texts of Scripture*, therefore, but our obligation to Scripture doth not follow from the effect, but from the inſtitution. Secondly, as for thoſe points which are neceſſary there needs be no diſputing upon the texts. Thirdly, the unſucceſſe

follows from the perverſneſſe of thoſe who will [illegible], and have more mind to victory than verity. Fourthly, why had they then in the Trent Council the Bible in the midſt of them? Why did the Divines urge Scripture? Yea, why did the Nicene Fathers determine the conſubſtantiality of the Son by Scripture? Yea, why did *Tertullian* combate with *Marcion* out of Scripture in his *de carne Chriſti, ch. 6. Si non probant quia nec ſcriptum eſt:* and again, *ſed nihil de eo conſtat, quia Scriptura non exhibet:* and again, ch. 7. *Non recipio quod extra Scripturam de tuo infers.* And why did he proceed againſt *Hermogenes* by Scripture, in his 22. ch. againſt him, *Adoro Scripturæ plenitudinem:* and again, *Scriptum eſſe doceat Hermogenis officina.* But fifthly, if we ſhould ſend the Sectaries to your Church for ſatisfaction, would this make an end of the differences? For the firſt queſtion would be, how your Church was proved to be the infallible Church? The Scripture, all that do diſpute out of it, do acknowledge to be the word of God: but all do not acknowledge your Church. Sixthly, if the Church could end ſo well all differences, why are ſo many queſtions undetermined, as about the Pope in relation to temporals, in relation to Councils: about predeterminations, about Immaculate Conception of the Virgin? Why are not theſe made an end of? Nay, ſeventhly, Heretick's have combated with the authority of the Church, and many were not ſatisfied with the determinations of Trent. Therefore let them not prejudice Scripture by the obſtinacy of Sectaries. Had not the Sectaries been ſet on and armed with their principles they might ſooner have been over come: and if nothing ſhould be made uſe of for our neceſſary direction but that which is convictive of all,

all, my Adversary might in reason have sate still, or brought better Arguments. Sectaries are not apt to be ruled by the meanes of Scripture: but his *mediums* are not apt to rule me without it.

*But the Church of God is the Kings High way by which a man is ever to travell to truth.*

*Ans.* I could smile at it, that Pontificians should use this expression, that the *Church is the King's High way*; when as some principles of some of the chief of them do dispose them as they think fit, to take Kings out of the way. But this by the way. Indeed their Church will lead us to *Rome* but not to truth. The universall Church will lead us sooner to truth than to *Rome*. But what way have we to lead us to this way? If the Church were the Kings high way, how shall we know how to get into the road? If we had a mind to go ἰδῇ βασιλικῇ, in the Fathers sense, the midle way; we should make use of the universall Church to find that which is held to be Scripture; and then go in the way of Scripture, which is Gods High way. And surely the Royall law is like to be the Royall way. And which is more reasonable, that the Scripture should be onely a directory to the Church, or the Church a directory to Scripture: if the former, then when we know the Church, we may leave the direction of Scripture and bid it goe back; for now we know the way: and so the Scripture should not be necessary, which yet is held by the Papists generally, and elsewhere acknowledged by my Adversary: if the latter, then is the Scripture the high way to truth. And therefore in the debate of truth the appeale lies from the Church to Scripture; not contrariwise. And so it must, for a distinct and perfect knowledge of the Church we

we must have from the Scripture, as before. So that that which is the rule of the rule must be the rule of that which is ruled, even in that wherein it is a rule. So then in the search of truth we must make the Scripture to be the way of our resolution, because by it we must know distinctly the Church. And not onely so, in the search of this truth, which is the true Church: but in other truths too which are necessary; unlesse the Scripture should refer us to the Church absolutely for truth: which is not yet demonstrated. Therefore as to humane perswasion, we plead the Church; as to faith, we plead the Scripture. By the Church we come to know what goes for truth in it: but by Scripture we come to know, whether that which goes for truth be so indeed. In things of question and of discipline we are not stoicall to the Church; but in busines of faith we must be Scepticks notwithstanding; were there any need in such things to say, οὐκ οἶδα, ἀλλὰ ζητῶ & πιστεύω. Things of faith may prevent questions on either side; things of question require no faith by necessity of matter on either side.

That he adds, *since by that means* (of Scripture onely) *either neither side will be victorious, or it is a hazard whether*; is not necessary to be answered, since we have formerly shewed the necessity of *appealing to Scriptures* and *disputing out of* them onely (as to faith in things of faith) which my Adversary would deny me upon this ground, because this debate out of Scripture would not afford a certain and clear victory. And as for victory, we hope they intend it not. No body is to get the victory in these disputes: for they are undertaken for truth. And for what is necessary to be believed, we have in Scripture the plain truth, and what

what is not neceſſary, one may have that victory and not the truth; and ſo one may have the truth and not the victory. Let them ſhew us truth and they ſhall not ſtay for the victory.

That which follows in this Sexion is conveniently retorted, and more to my Adverſary. *Theſe things he might have learned from the antienteſt Fathers*, as before, *if* he *had regarded their Doctrine. Yet ſince their authority hath ſo low a place in* his *eſteem in order to the finding out of truth*, which is againſt them, he doth not *lay aſide all that might be ſaid out of the Fathers* to *humor* me, as he ſays, but upon ſome other good reaſon: methinks he ſhould not ſo far ſpare his Adverſary, if he did ſee him not to be well guarded on that part, But, it is like, the truth is, when they produce the Fathers for them, then we muſt be their Children abſolutely, which is more than they would have us doe: but when we produce the Fathers for us, then they will not be their children at all. They muſt have the Fathers come all the way to them: otherwiſe they have nothing to ſay to them. Surely we had more reaſon to refuſe any dealing with the Fathers, becauſe we cannot recognize them as infallible, than my Adverſaries, who acknowledge them, when they pleaſe them, to be ſuch. And if the conſent of the Fathers be part of their principles they bragge of, they are to ſtand to their own principles, when we diſpute with them out of them; or elſe they betray them. We are not bound to ſtand to their principles, but they are bound by their own Laws, to anſwer to them.

Therefore this declining of any return to what I ſay out of the Fathers, or to my anſwers to what he ſaid, becauſe I will not own them as unerrable, muſt be ſet down a Κεφάλαιον.

So

Par. 14. So the beginning of the fourteenth Par. wherein you ſay, *I cut them off (by your own conſent) all you ſay concerning St.* Cyprian, *and the Criſis of St.* Auſtin *concerning St.* Cyprian, might have been ſpared. I have cut it off. I ſee he was ready to take all things for his advantage. If I had wholly refuſed to give any account to the teſtimonies of the Fathers brought againſt me, then though I had not given him a *formal* conſent, it might have been thought on *interpretative* conſent: but *falſum prius*. And therefore this is plain Sophiſtry in him.

*Yet I have a great mind,* (ex abundanti) *to tell you that St.* Auſtin *expreſſed exceedingly well, that Humility and Charity be thoſe virtues which made St.* Cyprian (*and ought to make us ſubmit to generall Councils, as a prime point of our bounden duty.*

*Anſ.* I take leave to ſay, that he hath ſkipped all my anſwers to the inſtance of St. *Cyprian*, but onely this. And then I ſay, that I have alſo a great mind to differ from him as little as may be. If he takes *to ſubmit to Generall Councils*, as controlling turbulent oppoſition, or in points of outward adminiſtration of the Church, I grant it: but if he takes it by an infallibility ingaging faith, then I deny it. Thoſe virtues are of uſe to the former ſubmiſſion, not to the latter. In the firſt ſenſe of Submiſſion Humility is diſpoſitive; but not the *actus Imperans*, as he ſays of moſt ſubmiſſive obedience. The *actus Imperans* of this externall ſubmiſſion is an act of internall obedience to God, as commanding ſuch obedience to the orders of thoſe whom under pain of damnation we are bound to obey, but in things lawfull and honeſt onely. And no further are we obliged to obedience. Therefore whereas he ſpeaks as if under pain of damnation we are bound

to

to *obey* them universally it is not so. And it will not be *Humility* to obey them in all things reduplicatively, but Pride against God. Therefore the Apostles, who understand their duty, said, Acts 4, 19. Whether it be just to obey God or you, judge ye.

But it may be a generall Council cannot command any thing unlawfull; so they say. No? They cannot *de jure*; but surely it is possible; were not the Apostles then commanded, after the Council had consulted, not to preach in the name of Jesus? And if they say the Council erred not in faith herein, but in point of action, we answer, first, they erred in the faith of a practicall point: that practicall *dictamen*, that such a command might be laid upon them, was erroneous. Secondly, they erred, *ex consequenti*, in this most fundamentall point, that Jesus is the Christ. And therefore thirdly, they erred so far, as by their error they destroyed Christian Religion. Therefore infallibility doth not univocably belong to Councils: therefore may they erre: therefore are we not absolutely to obey them: therefore Humility doth not dispose simply to an obedience of faith; such Humility is voluntary humility, and not a virtue.

And the *Divels Rebellion* he speaks of, for want of *Humility*, is not much to his purpose, though true: will this consequence be weighty, the Divill by Pride rebelled against God, therefore we by Humility would believe a Council in whatsoever they say? we are disputing now upon the obedience of belief, as he would have it: now the Divill did not rebell against God in point of disbelief, which respects the understanding; but in point of independency, which respects the will. The Divels Rebellion was against God, as the *Sum-*

*mum Bonum*, not as the *Summum Verum*. For as to belief ſimple, if there were a proper obedience in it, they ſeem to believe ſtill, and therefore to be obedient, if this were an obedience: becauſe they are ſaid to *believe and tremble*. And their Rebellion was a ſin of malice; and this ſpeaks a moſt free oppoſition of the will: but our unbelief of ſome things decreed in Councils, is neceſſary to the underſtanding as not ſeeing reaſon of aſſent; and therefore is it not to be charged upon want of Humillity.

Whereas then he ſays Pride *is ſtiled the Mother of Hereſie*, it is eaſily diſtingniſhed, that in Hereſie there are two parts, the materiall part, which is, the holding of that which is contrary to an Article of faith; and the formall part, which is the obſtinate oppoſing the Church in it. Pride is the Mother of the latter: but it is not abſolutely the Mother of the former. For the Apoſtles did not diſbelieve at firſt the Reſurrection of Chriſt upon pride. And then St. *Paul* could not have excuſed himſelf in the perſecution of the Church, that he did it by ignorance, and ſo there could be no ſimple error. So that what he ſays is not here pertinent: for we are now in diſpute about the obedience of faith, in his ſenſe; not about the obedience of peace. His argument concludes the latter rather than the former.

And this he prompts me to in his next words, *Now as Humility bringeth with her this neceſſary ſubmiſſion in the interiour: ſo Charity is the vertue which will be ſure to ſee that peace and unity be kept exteriourly in the Church.*

*Anſ.* The former part is ſufficiently evacuated, Humility and faith are not of the ſame Conjugation: faith hiſtoricall (which we ſpeake of) or dog-

dogmatical, is subjected in the understanding; Humility is a morall vertue. And a morall virtue cannot be a speculative principle. Neither are they always of a combination. For he that is humble is not always in the right opinion; and he that is proud is not always in the wrong opinion. And if Pride were but symptomaticall to error, it would be ill for *Rome*. But for the latter part, that *Charity* will endeavour to keep *peace and unity*, is not like to be denied, yet we must see that our Charity and Unity be regular, we must not for Charity lose Truth; though in pursuance of Truth we must not lose Charity. We hold our own, and give good words of others. We would be one in judgement, and that is of Charity: but not by conforming to any in error; so we should forsake truth. However we will not differ in love; for we can love those that differ, and pray for them: and be ready to joine with them when they will leave their error, or not injoin it to us.

Indeed the use of Councils is more respective to the formal part of heresie: and therefore we do formally satisfie them in reverence and peace; duely weighing what they decree, and decreeing to hold what is due. Grant no other submission; and urge no other *submission* to any *Councils*, and we have done.

Here the first five lines do beg the question which we have been disputing of, and if they did of themselves prove any thing, would prove more than that he speaks of, *exteriour unity*. For if the Church did unerrably lead us into truth, as the *Kings Highway*, then we should have one judgement and perswasion, which would make interiour unity. But though *exteriour unity*, as he speaks, is not sufficient to his dispute, yet is it enough for Par. 15.

the demand of the Church visible. The Church invisible (which, as such, hath a necessary connexion with salvation) consists of those who do agree as one in points proposed by God, because they are to be believed; and are ready to believe what is to be believed because proposed, when the proposall is clear. But the Church visible is contented with his exteriour unity, which is not broken by private suspension of assent, for this exteriour unity is sufficiently conserved, negatively, by a *non* opposition. Exteriour unity is contradistinguished to interiour, he provides for exteriour unity, then he provides for that which is contradistinguished to faith. What then is become of the application of all his discourse to faith in Councils?

But to let this passe. I see he doth not like my Syllogism for him. I put his matter in as good a form as it would bear in short and categorically: but he is not pleased with it; and therefore without further answer to it, he says, he will do it yet *more clearly for* himself *in this manner: under pain of damnation all are bound to agree in this, that every one interiourly giveth an infallible assent to all such points as are necessary to be believed for salvation: but all can never be brought to agree in giving interiourly this infallible assent to all such points, without they submit their assent to some living Judge indued with infallibility. Therefore all can never be brought to agree in that in which they are bound to agree under pain of damnation, without they all submit their interiour assent to some living Judge indued with infallibility.*

This is his Syllogism. And an answer is expected to it, although he would give no answer to mine, which gave him a distinction able enough to save the text, he seems to build upon, from his im-

impropriation of it. Yet we will give anſwer to his own form.

And as to his *major*, we grant it, that whatſoever is neceſſary to ſalvation is ſo far neceſſary to be believed as it is injoined unto ſalvation. And that propoſition of his is clearer than his proof; for his reaſon doth not infer it, namely, *becauſe all are obliged to pleaſe God, and to have that faith without which it is impoſſible to pleaſe God.* Ebr. For let the reaſon be put into form of an argument, and then let any one ſee whether it will be cogent thus: all are obliged to pleaſe God and to have that faith without which it is impoſſible to pleaſe God; therefore his *major* is true, under pain of damnation all are bound to agree, &c. No, one and the other are true, but one is not proved to be true by the other: that *axiom* in the ſcope of it ſpeaks of a faith as to that place onely in this particular, that there is a God. And therefore doth not this text aptly prove a neceſſity of interiour aſſent to all points neceſſary to be believed for ſalvation. It ſeems by the compendiouſneſſe of that text, that very few principles are neceſſary to be believed unto ſalvation, becauſe (according to my Adverſary) we may pleaſe God with the belief according to this text, which intends but that one main Principle, that *there is a God, and that he is a rewarder of them that dilligently ſeek him.* And ſo this will abate the plea of Mr. *Creſſy* and of my Adverſary, who contend, that there is a great number of things which are neceſſary to be believed *under pain of damnation.* And if he would extend that text virtually to a neceſſity of particular perſwaſion, that whatſoever we do is lawfull (as if it ſhould have the ſame ſenſe with that of the Apoſtle, *whatſoever is not of faith is ſin*)

Firſt,

First, that is not the meaning of the text. And then ſecondly, ſo it would exceed his purpoſe, which is for points of faith: for ſo it would alſo have reference to things indifferent; unto which the other text is properly applied.

Well, let us ſee his *minor* proved. He proveth it thus, *An infallible aſſent cannot be built but upon ſubmiſſion to an infallible authority, and no other infallible authority ſufficient to breed this agreement in their interiour aſſent to all points neceſſary can be aſſigned but the authority of the Church.* Well, the *major* of this Syllogiſm we grant: but firſt, how proves he the *minor*? (And yet we might alſo except againſt the form of it; for it ſhould be thus for the *minor*, but there is no infallible authority but the Church; and yet ſo the form is not right neither; for the *medium* is not duly placed.) But how proves he the *minor*? For this is yet to us the queſtion: out of queſtion he may prove what he will, if he can make the queſtion proof. And therefore leſt his *minor* ſhould appear to be groſly falſe, (for he by and by acknowledgeth the Scriptures authority to be infallible) and leſt that *minor*, as it ſhould be formed, ſhould not fully infer the *minor* of his proſyllogiſm, he ſhuffles in in the *minor* of his laſt, more than ſhould be.

And let me now make uſe of his principles. Without faith it is impoſſible to pleaſe God. In all definitions of the Church I cannot have faith. Therefore in all definitions of the Church I cannot pleaſe God. The firſt propoſition is Scripture, and a principle which he alſo uſeth. My ſecond propoſition I prove by his proof of his, thus. *An infallible aſſent cannot be built but upon ſubmiſſion to an infallible authority.* The Church is not yet proved

proved to have infallible authority; therefore cannot we have infallible assent in the definitions of the Church, and by consequent, not faith; for faith is in the nature of it an infallible assent.

Then towards the confirmation of his last *minor*, he comes over with the deniall of this property to Scripture, *The authority of Scripture, though infallible, doth not give us clear texts to ground our infallible assent upon them in all points necessary to salvation, as I shall shew in the next chap.* This is begging of the question in the second chap. not in the third, if it be there proved, but here he affords me then that which is a positive *minor* to my last Syllogism against him; and compleatly it is made by his own principles now, infallible assent is not built but upon submission to an infallible authority. The Authoritie of Scripture is infallible. Therefore, Both his own propositions. Onely the form of the discourse follows his.

But notwithstanding its infallible authority, he says, *It doth not give clear texts to ground our infallible assent upon them in all points necessary to salvation.* So that now all the question seems to be reduced to the debate about the clearness of the texts. He seems not to deny the texts in the subject, but denies them in the adjunct of clearnesse. Ans. First, if there be texts for all points necessary materially, then is that main opinion of the Papists about traditions sunk: for since they are said to come in upon way of supply of what is not set down at all in Scripture, and yet is necessary to be believed, then if all be set down in Scripture, but some things not clearly, then have we no need of any new matter of traditions, but only of traditive Interpretations, which what they are, and where they

they are, who can tell? Secondly, if he ſuppoſeth more points neceſſary to ſalvation than indeed are neceſſary, (as they are wont to do) then indeed the Scripture doth not afford clear texts for all things neceſſary in their opinion; yea, none at all for ſome of their opinions: but as to thoſe things which are really neceſſary, ſo we deny it. The Scripture hath ſufficient clearneſſe for all things neceſſary upon due account. Thirdly, The Councils do give us no other ſenſe of thoſe texts which are not clear in themſelves, than they are capable of: do they? No, he will ſay; for then they ſhould not declare the ſenſe of Scripture, but make it; which their greateſt Doctors, when they are in their ſober minds, do deny, then are we determined in the Controverſies by thoſe texts, and not by the authority of the Councils. The Councils do but rub the glaſſe that we may ſee more clearly the ſenſe, but it is the ſenſe which decides the point. They do not make the way of truth, but ſhew it, and therefore the Church is not the High way, but the Scripture. If they by their diſcuſſion and diſcourſe add one degree of claritude to thoſe texts, muſt the cauſality formal of the aſſent be attributed to their authority? They do but make clear the object; the aſſent of faith is not to the degree of clearneſſe, but to the object cleared. Fourthly, what if ſome of the greateſt Doctors do give all this power of explication of ambiguous Scripture to the Pope, and he conſtitutes the ſenſe imperially, not expounds it rationally; and makes his authority antecedent to the ſenſe, and not the ſenſe antecedent to their definition; but *ipſo facto* this muſt be the meaning thereof, becauſe he ſaith ſo? Is this a clearing of the Scripture? Fifthly, it muſt be clear to me that the Coun-

Councils have cleared the difficulty: otherwiſe I ſhould deny my aſſent to the text, becauſe it is not clear in the conſtruction, and yet ſhould give my aſſent to the Councils determination, and yet this not clear to me neither. Now then, if they will have us judge of the definition of the Council, that ſo we may determine our aſſent, (for we muſt by judgement conclude the Council clearly to determine the ſenſe in queſtion, or elſe we cannot give any due aſſent) why will they not allow us to judge alſo of the ſenſe of Scripture, that ſo rationally we may believe it? Sixthly, as the clarity is wanting, (as I ſuppoſe he means) but to ſome texts, ſo alſo but to ſome perſons; and therefore is there not an abſolute need to all of this infallible Judge. Yea, how many took liberty to ſuſpend their aſſents to the determinations of the Council of Trent: and yet they would have a Conncil to be binding to others? Seventhly, is the defect of the degree of claritude negative or privative? not privative; for that will charge God. And ſo that of *Nilus* will be true to be ſure, *he that accuſeth the Scripture accuſeth God*: but if negative, it is no other than God thought fit for his word. And do we think that God would require, under pain of damnation, belief to his word, and yet not give unto it competent clearneſſe reſpectively to the points of faith neceſſary to be believed? Eighthly, what then muſt we think, as towards their ſalvation, of all thoſe antient Chriſtians for ſome centuries, wherein they had not a Generall Council? were they all loſt? Or had they faith without a Generall Council? If the former, how do they ſay the Gates of Hell ſhall not prevail againſt the Church? And why do they alſo not diſ-acknowledge thoſe times of the

Church to have been the pureſt? And were ſo many of them Martyrs and yet loſt? But if the latter, then alſo may we have faith without a Generall Council ſufficiently to ſalvation. Ninthly, the ſenſes of Scripture as to particular points were clear to the Fathers in the Council ſeverally before they gave their ſuffrages on either part; were they not? If not, how came they to vote for that ſenſe which was right? If ſo, then the product of the Councils definition is not it which clears the ſenſe of the Scripture to them, and conſequently not to us. Tenthly and laſtly, if the Scripture doth not give us clear texts for all points neceſſary, and therefore we muſt ſtand to the authority of the Church; then alſo the Church ſhall not be it upon which we rely as a competent Judge; becauſe the Church, even in a Council, doth not deliver the ſenſe of Scripture ſo clearely as to end all controverſies. And this manifeſtly appears by peruſall of the Trent Hiſtory, wherein it frequently occurs, that the Decrees and Canons were ſo framed as to give a liberty of divers ſenſes for more ſatisfaction, and ſatisfaction to more.

And this laſt account in this laſt particular doth make ſufficient reply to what he ſpeaks in the ten next following lines; wherein he objects to me the difference of thoſe amongſt us to proceed from our acknowledgement of Scripture to be the triall of faith. Surely he did not the ſame day conſider the differences at home. It is not proper to object that which is common, we can retort it *mutatis mutandis*, *And we ſee with our eys thoſe who ſubmit to the authority of* the Church *as infallible, to diſ-*

*agree*

*agree mainly in these very points*, which the Synod hath spoken of: *for one thinketh in his Conscience* the Church *is to be understood one way*, *another thinketh in his Conscience* it *is to be understood another way*; *and this other is licensed* (interpretatively by the Synod) *to differ even from the greatest authority upon earth*, as the other thinks; because he thinks the Synod hath defined for him. And then he may easily have license to *differ from another private man*, *and that other private man hath as good ground to differ from the other*. So our Adversaries incussion of our differences amongst us is patly repercussed upon them; and with more weight and edge too; because secondly, we holding a difference of points by the matter, are capable of more excuse for our disagreements in things not fundamentall; than they, who holding all equally upon the proposall of the Church, must needs differ in that which is equally fundamentall; because all that is defined by the Church is equally so. Yea, also he that errs in one point with the Papists, according to Mr. *Knot's* argument, hath faith in none. And one of them that differ about the sense of the Council must needs err, though it is undetermined which. And therefore thirdly, would not my Adversaries have been pleased with such an argument from me, The Pontificians do disagree, therefore their opinion is the cause thereof, and if that should be the cause, we should all disagree, and in all. Neither fourthly, doe we license any to differ, but they take their natural liberty to suspend assent till they see the word of God, as well as upon good reasons you move men to chuse your Religion. And therefore, as to necessaries, Scripture is the *possible means of*

*Union in the interior man, in which faith onely doth consist.*

And this Union we are to consider in order to Salvation; not the exteriour union, which is not so necessary, though simply desirable. As far as truth will go, it must go with it, but not further. And yet this is now and then mingled in the discourse of my Adversary: and very politickly; because the Church hath more conjunction with an exteriour union of peace, than an interiour of faith.

*What you add of God his sufficiently providing for his Church by Scripture onely is in this sense true, that in Scripture we read that we are to hear the Church, &c.*

*Ans.* Surely I do not owe, in ingenuity, any thanks to any Adversary of mine for this, that they seem thus to please themselves in a study how to make our opinion tollerable. If I do, I will soon be out of debt, as soon as I can say, that their opinion, about the Church to be the High way to truth, is so far true; because it was wont to send us to the Scripture for our rule of faith and manners; as hath been shewed. Secondly, what Council ever determined the sense of that precept, *goe tell the Church* to be understood of a Council as to bind absolutely to the belief of all that they propound? And if a Council had not defined this the sense, then how shall we know it to be the sense, by my Adversary; because he saies, we must resolve our faith in the authority of a Council? and if it hath defined that the sense, how came they to have authority to define this to be the sense of the place? If not clear to this purpose, how came they to divine infallibly this

thirſenſe? for the Scripture according to them did not appear to have this ſenſe without a Councel; then, who gave authority to the firſt Councel to give this infallibly to be the ſenſe? It is clear, then have we no ſuch neceſſity of an infallible Judge for umpiring of litigant ſenſes. Thirdly, Tell it to the Church, *ex oi authoritatis*, as to teach: not *ex oi infallibilitatis*, in teaching: in regard of authority as to perſons: not infallibility, as to truth: Repreſentatively, in the office; not abſolutely, in the matter. We are to hear them as authorized to teach: but not ſimply to believe them, as if they were aſſiſted not to err. He that is appointed by Chriſt, and doth ſay that which is falſe, is not to be believed; becauſe, if he ſaies that which is true, it is not to be accounted true, becauſe he ſaies ſo, but he is to be accounted as to ſpeak true, becauſe it is ſo: yea, they may know that that text was applied by Chriſt as to cenſure in points of treſpaſſe, not to obedience in points of faith.

*Not that Scripture alone by her ſelf endeth all our differences, &c.*

*Anſ.* Who ever ſaid ſo? Who is his Adverſary? It were eaſie to have the victory without an Adverſary, if poſſible. No; Nor the Church *alone by her ſelf*. But we ſay alſo, the Scripture doth not formally end any, as they would have a living Judge; and yet is not deficient in neceſſaries; for by propoſing plainly what is neceſſary, it concludes neceſſarily againſt the neceſſitie of a living Judge infallible. What is neceſſary more than to believe that which is neceſſary? And therefore no need of traditions: and what more plain than that there

is

is no need of an infallible Judge, as to ſalvation; ſince what is neceſſary is plainly delivered in Scripture? It is ſufficient in the matter for neceſſaries: and it is clear enough in the manner, as to points of faith underſtood *ſignanter*. And would we be ruled by Scripture, there would be fewer Controverſies in the Church, and of the Church. And were not their Church a party for it ſelf, it would give all to Scripture. The intereſs of the Church hath brought in traditions, not for ſalvation, but for its authority. And the Scripture muſt not clearly have delivered all points neceſſary, becauſe then what reputation would be given to the authority and magnificence of the Church?

But we are invited much to the third chap. and expectation is raiſed, wherein he ſaies, *when I ſhall have fully ſet down the ſtate of the queſtion, you ſhall find all that you add in this place preſently anſwered.*

*Anſ.* This, he ſayes, ſhould be done before it be ſaid. If he will prove, that we muſt err in point of ſalvation without obedience to their judge. If he will prove, that all error is damnative: and if he can prove, that their Church, or the Church hath not erred, yea, cannot err; then we will excuſe him for repetitions in the third chap. for he cannot come off handſomely with anſwering in a third chap. what was ſaid in a former, more fully, unleſſe he ſaies much more to what is ſaid, than what he hath yet ſaid. But we do not prejudice his Judge.

CHAP.

## CHAP. III.

*Shewing that ſince Scripture alone doth ſufficiently propoſe all things neceſſary to ſalvation, there is no need of a living Judge infallible.*

HEre he ſaies at firſt, *You deliver your opinion in your anſwer to my third Num. p.* 12. thus. And then he tels me my opinion; of which he ſays, *no proof was given by you untill you came to this preſent place.* For proof he hath had as much as could reaſonably be required, and more, I ſuppoſe, than he deſired. But I was to follow him: and therefore he was not to accuſe me. And he might then have begun with the proof, if he would have made ſhort work. Num. 1.

He then prepares himſelf to reinforce the combate. And therefore he ſaies, *And firſt, I will take leave to ſtate this queſtion a little more fully and diſtinctly.*

*Anſ.* He uſeth his own right, if he will ſtate the queſtion more fully and diſtinctly; and it is right to do ſo. All good diſcourſe begins with a definition: and all regular diſputes with the ſtate of the queſtion. And it will be a favor to me, if he does it well; for we ſhall have done the ſooner. And ſo he ends his firſt number.

*Your aſſertion then is, that all things neceſſary to ſalvation are plainly ſet down in Scripture.* Num. 2.

*Anſ.* Yes, this is my aſſertion. And I am not aſhamed of it yet: for it is not mine alone; but the

the Scripture; and St. *Austin*, and others, as he hath heard before.

*In this assertion there be two things which need full and distinct declaration; the first is to declare these words* [*necessary to salvation.*] *the second to declare these words* [*plainly set down.*]

*Ans.* Content, let him be as good as his word, onely let him take care he doth not, as some he knew, confound that which is to be distinguished, and distinguish that which is to be confounded. So let him turn his answering to what I said against his assertion into an opposition of mine.

*And first, concerning those words necessary to salvation, they must of necessity be understood so, that all things are plainly set down in Scripture, which are necessary, first, to the universall Church, as it is a Community. Secondly, all things necessary to all states and degrees that must needs be in this Community. Thirdly, all things necessary to every person bound to be of this Community.*

*Ans.* This way he thought to destroy my assertion, as Mr. *Cressy* does, to destroy the assertion of Mr. *Chillingworth*: but it will not do. For here is he faulty, in confounding that which is to be distinguished. He should have distinguished betwixt necessaries to salvation, and necessaries to the universall Church, as it is a Community: though all that is necessary to salvation is necessary to the Church taken confusely of the persons: yet whatsoever is necessary to the universall Church as a Community, is not necessary to salvation; for then before there was a competent aggregation in a Community, there was no possibility of salvation. And that Community

munity is to be saved by the holding of things necessary, is it not? Yes, he would say, then this Community doth not come in to integrate things necessary to salvation: and if not, then those things which are necessary to this Community, doth not come in neither. Then he should have done well, secondly, to have distinguished betwixt a Church in its being, and in its well being. All things are not necessary to the being of a Church, which are requisite to the *bene esse* of it. Now salvation may be had in a Church which hath not its due well being. And thirdly, he might have distinguished betwixt necessity absolute and necessity of Convenience, with the School-men. All things are not necessary in the first kind, which are necessary in the latter. Now we are upon necessaries in the first kind. And as to these, fewer things there are of this order. These things are confounded for their advantage. But also he seems to distinguish what is to be confounded; for he seems to make some things necessary for the universall Church, *as a Community*. Whereas more is not necessary to the universall Church upon the formality of a Community. This was touched before; but herein he doth distinguish where he should not distinguish.

And thus by distinguishing what is not to be distinguished, and by confounding what is to be distinguished, he would confound me in the change of the state of the question. But this vain and captious. For the state of the question respects men *in communi*, not in a Community. Then secondly, suppose that the Scripture had not given us generall directions concerning the constitution of the Church, and the Officers of it, and the power of those Officers, and obedience to that power in

things of free obſervation in themſelves, yet our aſſertion would be ſound and good, that the Scripture doth ſet down plainly all things neceſſary to ſalvation. Some were ſaved before ſuch a Community: ſome may be ſaved who are wrongfully put out of ſuch a Community; and ſome may be ſaved after ſuch a Community is obſcured, and in the darke, as they confeſſe the Church ſhall be in the time of Antichriſt. But then thirdly, the Scripture hath ſufficiently provided, and as much as is neceſſary to be ſure, *how the Church is to be provided in all times and places of lawfull Paſtors.* And alſo what power the *Paſtors ſhould have in reſpect of one another, or in reſpect to their particular flocks.* And how thoſe laws they make ſhould bind without appointing *how many ſhould be aſſembled to this effect.* And alſo who ſhould *call* this *Aſſembly, who preſide in it,* when there are Chriſtian Magiſtrates; at leaſt negatively, not the Pope, (who hath nothing to ſhew for himſelf in Scripture) nor the Antient Church. And alſo *when it is to be accounted lawfull, when unlawfull.* This is ſufficiently determinable in Scripture by analogie to the Jewiſh Kings, and to the Aſſembly ſpoken of in the fifteenth of the *Acts.* As for the outward adminiſtration of theſe Aſſemblies will they ſay, it is *de Jure Divino*? And as for the queſtion, *whether the Precepts of this Aſſembly oblige under pain of damnation, to the keeping of Feaſts, or Faſts, or Eaves,* we ſay firſt, it doth appear in Scripture, that obedience to lawfull authority is due indefinitely and in generall; when there is no reall exception againſt the matter. And therefore by the Command of God are we bound in obedience to them, injoyning nothing but that which is lawfull. But though they do bind under pain of dam-

damnation; yet is not this a point neceſſary to be known under pain of damnation. The queſtion with us is not whether they do thus bind, but whether we cannot be ſaved without the knowledge whether they do thus bind. And if we may be ſaved without this knowledge, then is it not neceſſary to Salvation, that this ſhould be determined. For though it be neceſſary for us to know that all ſin is damnative (and this is ſufficiently laid down in Scripture, as *Rom.* 6. laſt:) yet is it not neceſſary under pain of damnation that we ſhould know every ſin that is damnative; for then we ſhould have no pardon for ſecret ſins by generall Repentance; and then who could be ſaved? And therefore though to every one that knows that this is a true propoſition, that Precepts of the Aſſembly do bind under pain of damnation, it is neceſſary to exerciſe actuall particular Repentance for thoſe tranſgreſſions which he knows; yet to him that knows not the truth of this propoſition it is not. And this is known to be a ſchool queſtion. And though they bind more than in caſe of ſcandall and of contempt, yet muſt their obligation mediate be underſtood to be qualified after the manner of the ceremoniall law, not the morall; and therefore in competition with morals their binding is relaxed. Again, if it were neceſſary that thoſe obſervations ſhould be generall, why did not the firſt Councils eſtabliſh them? Yea, it ſeems, it was not neceſſary that all ſuch obſervations ſhould be univerſally practiſed: For then how came the Eaſtern and Brittiſh Churches to differ from the Roman obſervation of *Eaſter*, notwithſtanding their pretences of preeminence? Yea, one of the Antients in application to the obſerving of *Eaſther*, which for the time he thought was free,

gave this sentence, in *Eusebius*: Ἡ διαφωνία τῆς νηστείας ὑμῖν πίστιν τῆς πίστεως συνίστησι; the difference of fast commends the agreement of faith. And therefore my Adversary doth, amongst his Festivities he mentions, wisely conceal the mention of *Easter*, because he knew the differences from the Roman Church in that particular.

And for the same form of *publick service*, which *ought to be imposed on all*, and *when all are bound to be present at it*; would any one say, that considers what he saies, that this is necessary to be, and to be known unto salvation? If he means to be *imposed upon all*, in the Catholick Church, what Scripture, or what Father, or what Council hath he for it? Indeed *Ignatius* in one of his Epistles, sayes, μία κοινὴ ἥκει ἐκ· but this was spoken as to a particular Church. And some cannot come to Church; and may not they be saved? and some particular nations must have some particular passages which are common to all the parts of that nation and not to other nations. And doe Canonicall hours so bind, as, not to be where they are, or not to assist always, upon morall necessity, excludes *de se* from Heaven? When the time of Antichrist comes, according to them, surely their Canonical hours will not be in season; and yet they will say, salvation may be had in the Church. Whereas necessaries to salvation do not fall under a necessity to be dispensed with. And therefore if such observances are excusable by accidents, it is sure that they are not in our sense necessary. These are onely *juris positivi*, as they distinguished in the Trent Council: but to be sure that which is necessary to salvation is *juris Divini*.

But *what Sacraments are to be administred* the Scripture telleth us expressely. For *time*, it is not neces-

neceſſary to have it determined, nor *how often*; but for the *eſſentiall form* it is ſet down: the externall manner is not ſimply neceſſary. Here he confounds cunningly, and mixeth ſomewhat neceſſary with ſomewhat not neceſſary. Neither doth he diſtinguiſh betwixt neceſſity of precept and neceſſity of meane, ſomewhat is neceſſary in the former way which is not neceſſary in the latter. And this latter is it with which we have to debate upon, in the right ſtate of the queſtion.

*All theſe things*, he ſays, *are neceſſary to a Church as a Community*. To follow him again, we ſay, firſt, that we deny that all theſe things are abſolutely neceſſary to a Church as a community: for ſeverall Churches have differed from one another in ſome of them; as in Faſts, and in the keeping of *Eaſter*, and in forms of Prayer: for as for the Liturgies they talk of, they are *filii populi*. Secondly, though neceſſary to a Church, yet not ſimply neceſſary to ſalvation. Thirdly, ſome of them may be neceſſary to a Church viſible, not neceſſary to the Church as inviſible: but he tampers about the change of the ſtate of the queſtion, to make what is neceſſary to ſalvation to be neceſſary to a Church as viſible; and whatſoever is neceſſary to a Church as viſible; to be neceſſary to ſalvation; which cannot be true. For as for that, that there is no ſalvation to be had out of the Church, (according to that of St. *Cyprian*, in his *Tract. de ſimplicitate Prelatorum*, *Habere non poteſt Deum Patrem qui Eccleſiam non habet Matrem*) yet this is to be underſtood of thoſe that are deſertors of the Church, as is to be ſeen there by the comparation of antecedents and conſequents and the whole ſcope of the *Tract*. And therefore ſimply what is neceſſary to a Church viſible is not neceſ-

neceſſary to ſalvation; becauſe, without contradiction to the Father, it may be poſſible to have ſalvation without the Church. And therefore may I conclude that my Adverſary did not well comply with his promiſe of ſtating this queſtion *a little more fully and diſtinctly.*

*And yet there is not one of all theſe things plainly ſet down in Scripture, whence very many and very important differences be amongſt Chriſtians.*

*Anſ.* All he ſays is not true. For the Sacraments are plainly enough ſet down in Scripture; for all that is therein eſſentiall and neceſſary. Then ſecondly, the Argument is not concluding, theſe things are not plainly ſet down in Scripture, therefore very many and very important differences amongſt Chriſtians. For firſt the unplaineſſe of them in Scripture is no efficient cauſe thereof; for they might in thoſe things give every one their liberty in their particular Churches; as St. *Cyprian* doth plainly ſhew us in his ſecond *B.* firſt *Ep.* where having ſpoken of ſome who did hold thoſe things which they did once take up, he ſpeaks notwithſtanding---*ſed, ſalvo inter Collegas pacis et Concordiæ vinculo, quædam propria quæ apud ſe ſemel ſunt uſurpata, retinere; quæ in re nec nos cuiquam facimus, aut legem damus, cum habeat in Eccleſiæ adminiſtrationis voluntatis ſuæ arbitrium liberum unuſquiſque præpoſitus, rationem actus ſui Domino redituras.* So he: Therefore may they not all practiſe the ſame thing, and yet there be no morall difference: if negative differences, not poſitive contentions: if ſome, yet not many: if many, yet not important, in point of ſalvation, becauſe each Biſhop in his Church hath free power to eſtabliſh what he thinks fit. And what Generall Council hath

hath bound the universall Church in all these particularities? Yea, again, the unplainess of these things in Scripture is not the *causa sine quæ non* of these differences: for there are differences with the Roman Church against others, even in some things which are plainly set down in Scripture: as in point of justification, against Images to be worshipped: against half Communion; and generally the differences betwixt us. And indeed what is there so plain about which some have not differed? And then again, how is this mended by a Council? Not by their Council of Trent; because in their Decrees the sense is not plain. Therefore let them find better provision than God hath made directly in Scripture, before they find fault with Gods direction as to those things which are *important* unto salvation: for otherwise the term is ἀπὸ τὸ ἐπικαιρότερα, it is beside the state of the question.

Nextly, he objects the differences amongst us about *Bishops with such and such a power and authority, and that without them you can have no true Priests or Deacons, and without these no true Sacraments, things so necessary to the salvation of all men.*

*Ans.* This is a question belonging rather to the Church than to salvation: and therefore we need not say any more to it. Yet secondly, the differences amongst us are for the most part stirred upon the occasion of the Bishop of *Rome*: and therefore the Pontificians have no cause to impute to us as a fault the disagreement of Protestants in this point; because it ariseth in great part from the domination of the Bishop of *Rome*. They thought by an ἀμηχανία ἀνδρικὴν, that they could never sufficiently gainsay the Roman Bishop but by cashiering the whole *genus*; and there-

therefore to make all ſure, they denied all Biſhops; ſince the Argument is good *a negatione generis ad negationem ſpeciei*; if no Biſhop, then not univerſal. Indeed here they erred, if they thought that the poſition of Biſhops did inferr the univerſall: for it doth not follow *a poſitione generis ad poſitionem ſpeciei determinatæ*: and therefore they might have Biſhops, and not him. Yea, the holding of Biſhops by Divine right is as like a mean to deſtroy the Pope's authority as any other. And to this purpoſe was it ſo holty diſputed in the Trent Council: and ſome loſt their favor with the Pope for being eager in the affirmative. And in the promotion of Cardinals at the end of the Synod, the Pope profeſſed he would paſſe by thoſe who had ſtood for Reſidence and Biſhops to be *jure Divino*. For this inſtitution of them by Divine right made them not to depend upon the Pope, which would weaken his authority.

And therefore as to the Controverſie about Biſhops, whether we derive them and their authority from Scripture, my Adverſary might have done well to have ſaid nothing: ſince if it be neceſſary to be determined clearly, then the Trent Council is to be blamed for not determining it. If it be not neceſſary, then why doth he put it in amongſt neceſſary queſtions. To this therefore we ſay no more than thus, Had there not been Biſhops there would not have been a Pope; (and therefore is this an argument that there were Biſhops in the Antient Church, for how otherwiſe could there have been a Biſhop univerſall) ſo alſo had there not been a Pope, there would have been leſſe contention about Biſhops: as appears by this, that if *Petrus Balma*, who was the laſt Biſhop of *Geneva*, would have turned Proteſtant, he might have continued Biſhop.

As

As for *no true Sacraments without Priests and Deacons*, we say, if he takes Priests in a proper sense, we deny that there is now any such to be; because there is now no reall externall sacrifice. If he takes it in the Analogicall sense, we have no reason to doubt of true Priests; being rightly ordained. And for those who have not Bishops, some of them would have them, if it were in their power; as *Bogerman* said, in the Council of *Dort*, when that Government was commended to him, *Domine nos non sumus adeo felices*. And as for those who are ordained without Bishops (were this our case) we may be as sure they are true Ministers, as the Papists can assure themselves that they have true Priests; in respect of the uncertainties they are under of the due intention of the Priest in Baptism, and of the Bishop in Ordination.

As to *Deacons*; they might have been left out of the rank with Priests as to true Sacraments, for it will not appear that Deacons are appointed *jure Divino* to assist the Ministers in the Sacraments; and if so, yet not to be necessary to true Sacraments, that they do assist, otherwise no true Sacraments. What shall this also with the Romans goe into the account of articles of faith? And shall this be as necessary to be believed as that Jesus is the Christ?

*Sacraments, things so necessary to the salvation of all men.* This we have spoken to before; and it comes in here under a simple diction, and not positively (as it may be interpreted) affirmed; or if [so necessary] be to be taken *signanter*, then is it more easily denied, as *to all men*. Our former distinction is yet good, necessary by necessity of precept, not by necessity of mean. Neither is the other Sacrament so necessary as that: and yet are

they put together upon equall neceſſity. The Sacraments bind us, not God, to work only by them. And alſo are they adminiſtred as duely with us as elſwhere.

Then he brings in a Syllogiſm againſt us out of my owu words, *What is not plainly delivered in Scripture is thereby ſignified not to be neceſſary: but it is not plainly delivered in Scripture that the Church ſhould be governed by Biſhops with ſuch and ſuch authority.*

Thus he would bring in ſome of thoſe who differ from them, and us in this point, diſputing againſt Biſhops. But how would he conclude? Therefore not neceſſary to ſalvation? unleſſe he concludes thus, it doth not contradict us in our debate. And if he does conclude ſo, he concludes beſide their intention: for they would conclude no more than that they are not neceſſary to the Government of the Church: becauſe it is not held by others, that this Government with *ſuch and ſuch authoritie* is ſimply neceſſary to ſalvation.

But to the aſſumption, we ſay, *dato*, that the Government of the Church by Biſhops with ſuch and ſuch power is not plainly ſet down in Scripture; yet let them ſhew as much out of Scripture with the practice of the Church for the Biſhop of *Rome* his being univerſall Biſhop, as we can ſhew out of Scripture for Biſhops with ſome authority ſuperior to Preſbyters; and I ſhall think better of their cauſe. And therefore let them remember, *Parvi ſunt foris Arma niſi eſt Conſilium domi.* Let them make ſure at home before they combate us with our own contentions. For ſecondly, as for *ſuch and ſuch authority*, if he takes it for the Mathematicall point and indiviſible degree, which the Biſhop muſt have, of authority over the reſt of the Clergie;

Clergie; who is there that ſo contends it, but the Roman? Some ſuperiority in the latitude may be able to conſerve the form: and this is more eaſily proveable out of Scripture with the practice of the Church.

But thirdly, ſince he hath brought the Antepiſcoparians upon the ſtage to make ſport for them; what will the Pontificians ſay, if this argument be in earneſt brought againſt them, *whatſoever is neceſſary is plainly ſet down in Scripture*? Government by Biſhops *with ſuch and ſuch authority is not plainly ſet down in Scripture*, therefore not neceſſary. The *major* propoſition is yet true and good againſt all his batteries. The *minor* is to have their advice, whether they will affirm it or deny it; let them ſpeak categorically: is it plainly ſet down or not? If it be plainly ſet down, then this inſtance is againſt them, if it be not plainly ſet down, then they have nothing plainly ſet down for the Biſhop of *Rome* upon the former rule: if there be no Biſhop plainly ſet down, then not the Biſhop of *Rome*. This he gets by our contentions.

As for *the form of ordaining Prieſts* or Preſbyters, it is ſufficiently ſet down, and we have it practiſed with us without the *Patin* and the *Chalice*: and that none but thoſe who are Prieſts formally or eminently, as being more, ſhould bleſſe the bread and conſecrate the Sacrament; this is clearly enough ſet down; and what kind of bread for the Sacrament, as much as is neceſſary, is ſet down. The Pontifician hath no reaſon, if he conſiders himſelf, to urge all particularities about the Sacraments, ſince he accounts them ſo neceſſary: would God pinch that which is neceſſary under ſo many contingences, which he

doth not ordinarily provide against? Therefore either they are not necessary; and then why are they insisted in? Or if necessary; yet not in all the severall circumstances: for then under how many accidentalities should salvation be included?

He says then, she could add many more particulars to the former kind *no lesse necessary to be decided*. If no more necessary, it is not like to trouble us. *Or if necessary, they should be decidable by plain Scripture.* Yes, if necessary to salvation. *And then your Doctors could not jarr about them.* This I deny, and he had better have taken our grant, that those of this sort are not plainly set down in Scripture, unlesse he had proved it more strongely than by our differences. It is possible to differ in plain things: but we need not. Ἠ παραδιδοῦσι παραμυθίαν, St. *Mark* the 6. 53. And again this is retorted. Many things might be named which were in the opinion of some Pontificians *no lesse necessary to be decided*, than the point of originall sin, the immaculate conception of the Virgin, the point of Residence and of Bishops whether by Divine right; and yet are they not determined in the Trent Council: no nor those neither positively. But it may be they are not necessary: for if necessary *they should be decidable* by *plain* Decree of Council: and *then the Doctors could* not jarr about them. But to give a further check to this unreasonable exacting of such particularities to be plainly decided by Scripture: let them consider generally how little was affirmatively defined and clearly in the Council of Trent. Yea, for further instance, are these severals which he hath pointed at more necessary to be decided than the point of Indulgences, which was the main point which

which occaſioned the diviſions of the Council conſequently? And yet was not this ſufficiently handled: yea, as the Author of the Hiſtory ſays, the Proteſtants complained that the Synod had paſſed it over without clearing any doubt or deciding any Controverſie. If they could not or would not, how ſhall we be bound under pain of damnation to take our infallible and certain guidance from them.

But *ecce iterum Criſpinus* —— *ſome of you will hove no words at all neceſſary to the adminiſtration of Baptiſm, ſome will have ſuch kinds of words, and others, words very different from them in ſubſtance.* He makes our differences not onely by occaſion, but for ought I ſee by fiction alſo: for I know none that would have no words, or different in ſubſtance, or if they would; let them anſwer for themſelves. The eſſentiall form of words as to Baptiſm is as plainly ſet down as can be by words in Scripture, in the 28 of St. *Mat.* 19. *Baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghoſt.* And if any differ from this form then my Adverſaries argument was nought, whereby he would prove things not to be plainly ſet down; becauſe there were differences about them; for what can be more plainly ſet down than the form of Baptiſme? and yet he talks of differences thereabout. In the third and fourth Paragr. he proſecutes the ſame impertinencies to the queſtion in hand. And untill he proves all the points he doth inſtance in to be ſuch as are neceſſary to ſalvation in the ſame punctualities, I have nothing to do but to deny them to be ſuch as without which *in formalitatibus*, there is no ſalvation. *Ubi eadem ratio eadem lex.* According to the proportion of their uſe is the proportion of their appointment in Scripture. As

As for ſuch things as *are of ſtrict neceſſity to certain men of certain ſtates and degrees in the Church.* It goes upon a falſe ſuppoſition, that what is of ſtrict neceſſity to certain men of certain ſtates and degrees in the Church, ſhould be of ſtrict neceſſity to ſalvation: nothing is of ſtrict neceſſity to ſalvation but that which is neceſſary to all unto ſalvation. Now it is not neceſſary to all unto ſalvation, to know what is of ſtrict neceſſity to ſome certain men of certain ſtates and degree. And ſecondly, little in reaſon can be ſaid to be of ſtrict neceſſity to ſome certain men of certain degrees and ſtates in the Church; firſt, becauſe many nations have diverſified theſe uſages, and ſecondly, becauſe no generall Council have deſcended to the binding of all abſolutely thereunto, nay, indeed not to the propoſing of them.

And as for the forme of ordaining *Biſhops in words or actions*, the way in our Church is as full according to proportion in Scripture as any other, and our Biſhops have been alſo Canonically ordained by three Biſhops, notwithſtanding the ſlanders againſt it: and let them prove, that what is in this caſe appointed in Councils is more neceſſary than what is done in our conſecration, or elſe they do nothing.

*They muſt alſo know whether they can lawfully permit women to baptize at all, or baptize in neceſſity only, and not out of it.*

*Anſ.* Firſt, it is plain in Scripture that no women did baptize. Secondly, that baptizing and teaching are committed to the ſame perſons, as before, St. *Mat.* 28. 19, 20. Now women are forbidden to teach by St *Paul*, therefore may they not baptize. Thirdly, how can mans authority allow that which God hath reſtrained, ſo as to make

it

it neceſſary to ſalvation that this allowance ſhould be made, and alſo that all ſhould know it? And fourthly, it is yet to be proved whether there be ſuch abſolute neceſſity of baptiſm, as to diſpenſe herein in caſe of neceſſity, ſince St. *Thomas* was of opinion, as was urged in the Trent Council, that before Chriſt, children were ſaved by the faith of the Parents, and without the Sacrament; as it muſt be there meant, p. 239. of the Hiſtory. I know ſome ſpeak favorably in this point, not allowing it ſhould ſo be done, but as not annulling it when done: but my Adverſary ſhould firſt have made the *Subſtratum* ſound and good, namely, the abſolute neceſſity to ſalvation. For if we ſhould be ruled by St. *Auſtin* in this matter, then we ſhould be ruled by him in all points: which they themſelves will not ſtand to; for they withſtand him in more particulars than we, as hath been noted by Mr. *Chillingworth*. And beſides, his authority we might confront with *Tertullian's*.

*And whether they may permit women or Lay-men to bleſſe the bread and diſtribute the Sacrament, ſeeing that Chriſt ſaid, do this all, not plainly expreſſing how far theſe his words extended themſelves.* Surely my Adverſary intended me rather good meaſure, than good weight in ſuch argumentations. St. *Paul* doth, one would think, determine this queſtion, if any, in the firſt Ep. to the *Cor.* 4. 1. Where he ſaies of Miniſters in general, that they are the Diſpenſers of the Myſteries of God. And then is this their bleſſing or diſtributing, if it might be allowed, neceſſary to ſalvation? And for his argument, it is improperly produced; for it is ſpoken to them not as Officers of the Church in adminiſtring, but as members of the Church in receiving: and this might he have taken notice of

if

if he would have quoted the text intirely; for it is ſaid, Do this in remembrance of me, St. *Luke.* 22. 19. This belongs to every one in the act of participation. And then again, as he leaves out ſomething not for him, ſo he adds ſomewhat which ſhould be for him, for he reads it *do this all*, whereas *all* is not in the Evangeliſts; nor in the firſt Ep. to the *Cor.* 11. Again, if it be uncertain whether our Savior meant this for women and Laiques, *do this all*, then ſince by theſe words they would urge Chriſts inſtitution of the Sacrifice, Laymen and women ſhould have the higheſt, or might have (if the Church pleaſed) the higheſt dignity in their account in the Church; and that is *conficere corpus Chriſti*. And then the ſtory of Pope *Joan* ſhould be accounted of by them as more tolerable. If ſhe might do the office of a Prieſt, ſhe might alſo do the office of a Pope.

*Whether lawfull miſſion of Prieſts can be granted by Laymen or no.* What? And muſt all we upon neceſſity of ſalvation know infallibly this, whether this Prieſt was ſent by a Layman? though a Layman hath not, nor can have, any authority to ſend, and the Roman in this gives more liberty to Laymen than the Scripture or our Churches, yet is it neceſſary for every one to ſalvation to know whether ſuch an one which doth the offices of a Miniſter is legally ſent or not? Muſt every Layman examine his Commiſſion? And our Saviors inſtitution herein is our rule, who gave power to others by that authority which he had received from his Father, as St. *Mat.* 28. 18. *Authoritate mihi commiſſa*, all authority is given me in Heaven and on earth, goe ye therfore. Now Laymen have no authority, and therefore they cannot give any authority, according to the rule alſo.

And

And *what kind of ordination is neceſſary for their function*, and *what commiſſion is neceſſary for their lawfull miſſions*, and alſo *what power to make* (that is to conſecrate) *and adminiſter Sacraments*; theſe are *plainly* enough *ſet down in Scripture*, if the Roman Church had not diſturbed the clear waters for the chief Fiſher; and if not, the Church by poſitive law cannot appoint that which is abſolutely neceſſary to ſalvation. All things that are of Divine right are not ſimply neceſſary to ſalvation: to be ſure then what is not of Divine but poſitive right, as the Romans have alſo diſtinguiſhed, is not ſimply neceſſary.

And therefore whereas he ſays, *there are endles Controverſies about them*, I am of his opinion in my ſenſe of the words; for they are to no end amongſt thoſe who have a ſober mind to be directed in them by Scripture; at leaſt they are to no end, as in order to our diſpute; becauſe they come not within compaſſe of abſolute neceſſity to ſalvation. It may be neceſſary to know how theſe are to be ordered, that they may be ordered rightly: but this is not abſolutely neceſſary to ſalvation: yea again, if theſe things were left to the Church, we muſt take the order before the Councils: otherwiſe the Church before the time of Councils had wanted that which was neceſſary: and therefore indeed are they not neceſſary: or elſe God had been wanting to them in neceſſaries.

A third ſort of things neceſſary not plainly ſet down, as he thinks, we have in his fourth number. *All being obliged to ſerve God in a true Church*, &c. This is ambiguouſly delivered: either as *in ſenſu compoſito*, being in a true Church they are obliged to ſerve God in it; or are bound to finde out the true Church, and then to ſerve God in it. Now Num 4.

though both belong to our duty, yet both are not equally neceſſary: becauſe it is poſſible in that which is not a true Church (if ſo many things be neceſſary to a true Church as they would have) ſalvation may be had by ſimple ignorance and gerall repentance. And I hope ſome were ſaved before a Church, with all the integrants of a true Church, was framed. But in a true Church no man can be ſaved without ſerving of God. The Church of the Donatiſts was not accounted, by St. *Auſtin* nor my Adverſary, a true Church, yet St. *Auſtin* did not deny but ſome might be ſaved in it. Now this is underſtood by my Adverſary in the latter way, namely that every one is bound to finde out the true Church and to ſerve God in it, for ſo it followeth.

*Having a lawfull ſucceſſion of true Paſtors truely ordained themſelves, and truely ordaining the Prieſts, who muſt be known to adminiſter true Sacraments in their true matter and forme, Preaching alſo the word of God by lawfull miſſion.*

*Anſ.* Now me thinks the Romans with their mountains ſhould have relation to *Montanus* who fanſied that the *Paraclet* did by priviledge come into him, to make up what was wanting to ſalvation, by inſpiration. For we muſt have infallible notes of a Church, which the word of God in Scripture hath not appointed to us. And we muſt have things neceſſary to ſalvation, which the Scripture hath not made neceſſary: yet they muſt be neceſſary to ſalvation, for their uſe. Certainly as he gives well the cogniſance of a good man, ſo may we alſo make uſe of it for a good Chriſtian, χρὴ γὰρ οὐκ ἐκ τῆς ἐπιτηδεύσεως κρίνειν τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς ἄνδρας, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῆς προαιρέσεως, we ought not to judge honeſt men by their performances but by their purpoſe: ſo

ſo we ought to eſteem good Chriſtians not by their happineſſe to finde, but by their purpoſe to finde out the true Church; which cannot reaſonably be done by a lawfull ſucceſſion. Firſt, becauſe this is accidentall, not as to ſalvation onely, but as to a true Church: and therefore can be no certain and univerſall rule: for how came the firſt Church, which was originall to the Deſcendants, to be a true Church? yea ſecondly, how will the true Church be a true Church, according to their principles in the time of Antichriſt, when there is not like to be, according to their profeſſion, almoſt any face of a Church? How ſhall it then be diſcerned by a lawfull ſucceſſion of Paſtors. Thirdly, this cannot be characteriſticall of the Roman Church (which they would have to be the onely true Church) becauſe the Greek Church may challenge this priviledge alſo. Yea, fourthly, it is poſſible that a falſe Church may ſo fairly plead a lawfull ſucceſſion (as the Church of the Donatiſts who had alſo Biſhops) as to thoſe who ſhould come a long while after them, that it could not be eaſily diſcerned by common people: and therefore this is not the way ſo plain and direct *as that fools cannot err*. Yea, fifthly, we are not to diſcern true Doctrine by the perſons, but the perſons by the Doctrine, according to *Tertullian*, as before: and therefore if true Doctrine be not proved by ſucceſſion (as it cannot be, becauſe then it ſhould be meaſured by the perſon) we cannot conclude a true Church by the ſucceſſion; ſince all ſober men will rather argue thus; that is a true Church which profeſſeth true Doctrine, than that Church profeſſeth true Doctrine, becauſe it hath a true ſucceſſion of Paſtors. Yea, ſixthly, did my Adverſary mean what he ſaid of a particular Church, or of the

universall Church? Not of a particular Church sure; for that cannot be the way and Judge of all Christians, as he intended: But then of the universall Catholick Church. Well then, he must mean that that is the true Catholick Church which hath a *lawfull succession of Pastors*, namely, of Bishops of *Rome*, who is by them called signantly the Pastor of the Church: This must be his meaning in reason, because the lawfull succession of Pastors in particular Churches is, by my Adversary, necessary for themselves; but not for the Catholick Church, which can consist without those parts which are not true (and therefore no parts.) And this is like to be his meaning by his opinion. So then the Roman Church he would have here by the premisses to be the true Church, as being supposed to have a lawfull succession of Pastors, namely, Bishops of *Rome*. But how shall we give up our selves in absolute obedience to the guidance of the Roman Church, if this were an infallible and constitutive mark of the true Church, that it hath a lawfull succession of Pastors? For no man can have so much as a morall certitude that there hath been in *Rome* from St. *Peter* an interrupted lawfull succession of Pastors, much lesse can he have a Divine perswasion thereof. For first, it can never be proved by Scripture that St. *Peter* was at *Rome*. I do not deny it that he was ever there; but it is no object of faith. And the Romanists are shrewdly put to it for a proof, when, to prove it, they would interpret *Babylon*, from which St. *Peter* writes, to be *Rome*. But then Secondly, St. *Peter* should rather have derived the Priviledge of universall jurisdiction and infallible direction to *Antioch*, as is observed, where he sate first seven years, as *Caranza* sets it down, and where Christians had their name.

name. Thirdly, it is a great queſtion upon the ſuppoſition, who ſucceeded St. *Peter* in the ſea of *Rome*, and *Cartanza* cannot determine it. Fourthly, St. *Peter* was appointed rather for the Jews than for the Gentiles: and therefore the Trent Council in their comminations do very well to put St. *Paul* with St. *Peter*; for indeed St *Paul* was the Doctor of the Gentiles. Yea, fifthly, for ſix hundred years together there was no Paſtors at *Rome* in their ſenſe, not Paſtor of the univerſall Church, as appears by *Gregory's* proteſtation againſt *John of Conſtantinople*, who would arrogate and uſurp univerſall juriſdiction.

And therefore there was not alwyes in the Church, in my Adverſaries ſenſe, a lawfull ſucceſſion of Paſtors; becauſe there was not Paſtors in his ſenſe: and ſo by his argument, there ſhould not have been a Catholick Church for that time. Yea, Sixthly and laſtly, how can we be aſcertained, by certitude of faith, that there was ever a lawfull ſucceſſion of Biſhops in *Rome*; becauſe we are not certain, in that kind of certainty to be ſure, nor indeed in any other, that the Popes were true Biſhops or true Prieſts, or true Chriſtians, becauſe their principles bring it into queſtion by the uncertainty of the qualifications of thoſe who were to make them Chriſtians by Baptiſm, or Prieſts by orders, or Biſhops by conſecration? And alſo ſecondly, becauſe ſome, as it is known by Hiſtory, have got into the ſea by *Simonie*; which makes it diſputable even amongſt themſelves whether it did not *ex vi Criminis* make them no Biſhops. And the thirtieth Canon of the Apoſtles (which they acknowledge as binding too) injoins, that ſuch as get their dignity by money ſhould be put out. Yea, thirdly, when there were Antipapes how

how could the Common people by assurance of faith know which was the right? For though they say, that he is to be accounted the right whom the Council doth accept; yet is it a question whether they can infallibly judge in the case; otherwise no certainty of faith. And then there is not always a Council; and how can the Council be called without a true Pope? If they may, then is not the Pope essentiall to the infallibility of the Church.

This is answer enough to what he says about his *lawfull succession of true* Pastors; that which appends hereunto is collaterally answered here; more particularly before.

*He goes on, It is necessary to the salvation of every man to believe and do some things, and not to do some other things not plainly set down in Scripture.*

*Ans.* Not so necessary as it is not to beg the question so often. This proposition doth indeed plainly contradict our proposition, but doth not prove it to be false, unless it by it self did evidently appear to be true. Therefore it is enough for me to deny it, being the Respondent. But we see by the way, that those who make the Church its infallibility their first principle, are apt to make all it says to be as clear as the first principles of Sciences. He that believes, and does according to Scripture, is surer of salvation than all the Church can make him. Ἀσφαλὴς ὁδός, as *Ignatius's* phrase is, He that goes by the rule is safe; he that goes by Scripture in faith and obedience goes by the rule. Therefore, Now God hath proposed the Scripture as our rule, by *Bellarmin's* confession in the beginning of his Controversies, as before. And if it be not a compleat rule, then indeed is it not a rule; for it comes

comes ſhort of a rule; and this will not ſerve *Bellarmin's* uſe; becauſe then they whom he diſputes againſt might have urged their revelations beſide the rule, though not againſt it, as the Pontificians are pleaſed to diſtinguiſh. And as for point of faith, we have (beſides what teſtimonies out of the Fathers for this I have given before) the plain authority of St. *Cyrill* of *Jeruſalem* in his 4 *Cat. p.* 85. *Edit. Gr. Lat.* Δεῖ γὰρ περὶ τῶν θείων καὶ ἁγίων τῆς πίστεως μυστηρίων μηδὲ τὸ τυχὸν ἄνευ τῶν θείων παραδίδεσθαι γραφῶν. Concerning things Divine and the holy Myſteries of faith, there ought not to be delivered any thing without the Divine Scriptures. And therefore in another place he underſtands by traditions the ſum of thoſe things that were taken out of Scripture, as in the 5 *Cat. p.* 117. And ſo *Tertullian* in his *Præſ. cap.* 13. His *Regula fidei*, is a ſum of main points of Doctrine taken out of Scripture. And concerning this rule he ſayes, *Adverſus Regulam nihil ſcire, omnia ſcire eſt.* And ſo *Irenæus* alſo means tradition τὸ λόγον, in ſeverall places.

Indeed *Tertullian*, and *Irenæus*, and *Cyprian*, and *Baſill*, and *Auſtin*, are quoted by the Pontificians in the Trent Council, for holding that the Chriſtian faith is contained partly in the Scriptures and partly in traditions. But for theſe Fathers (if their conſent did ground infallible aſſent) are either miſ-underſtood or elſe are contradictory to themſelves? and therefore we cannot rely upon them; becauſe one part of the contradiction muſt be falſe. As for St. *Auſtin*, I have formerly quoted him for holding, that all things neceſſary to faith and manners are amongſt thoſe things which are plainly contained in Scripture. And St. *Baſill* I have produced too. And as for *Cyprian*, we will quote him for the other part, namely, of action.

action ( though we might alſo name him for Scripture to be the rule in things of faith; for he makes his proofs from Scripture.) In his ſecond *B.* of Epiſtles, third Epiſtle, he hath theſe words, *Quare ſi ſolus Chriſtus audiendus eſt, non debemus attendere quid aliquis ante nos faciendum putaverit, ſed quid qui ante omnes eſt Chriſtus prior fecerit. Neque enim hominis Conſuetudinem ſequi oportet, ſed Dei veritatem.* Wherein he oppoſeth the truth of God to whatſoever cuſtom. And the truth of God he underſtands to be of the word written; for there he proves all about the Cup in the Sacrament to be mingled with Wine and Water, out of Scripture, which proves however he took Scripture to be our rule in Agents.

Yea, alſo this point was agitated by *Marinarus* in the Trent Council: where he delivered his
P. 151. z. opinion, that the Fathers did not make Tradition to be equall to Scripture; and therefore was he reprehended in the Council by Cardinall *Poole* for not allowing, that Articles of faith are divided into two kinds: *ſome publiſhed by writing: others commanded to be communicated by voice.* And can any ſober man imagin that God ſhould by his ſpirit give order for the writing of the Myſtery of the Goſpell, and yet ſhould alſo give order by his Spirit that ſomewhat ſhould not be written, but kept in Myſtery for orall tradition, and yet ſhould be as much neceſſary as that which is written? ----*credat Judæus.*

*Every one is to believe ſome things diſtinctly. Now which theſe things be, or how many, Scriptures expreſſe not.*

*Anſ.* Let this be taken for an antecedent: will it be concluced from hence, that therefore all things neceſſary are not plainly ſet down in Scripture?

ture? For though we have not the formall and materiall number of things diſtinctly to be believed: yet all that is diſtinctly to be believed may be plainly ſet down there. And therefore if we believe them, we believe ſufficiently. Therefore if he takes the terme, [*diſtinctly*] in this ſenſe, that we muſt neceſſarily know, that this is one of the points neceſſary to be believed, we deny it, of every point that is neceſſary: although we may ſay ſo of ſome, as that Jeſus is the Chriſt; becauſe in Scripture ſalvation is denied any other way, as, *Acts.* 4. 12. If he takes the term as ſignifying that ſome things are actually and explicitly to be believed, we grant it; but the conſequence ſo is not valid. Secondly, this returnes upon them, and therefore ſhould they not have moved this ſtone. For where have theyſet down a liſt of all thoſe things which by every of themare neceſſary to be believed *diſtinctly* in contradiſtinction to their implicit faith? And if they ſay, that they are ready diſtinctly to believe whatſoever is propoſed by the Church: ſo we ſay, that we are alſo ready to believe whatſoever ſhall be ſufficiently propoſed out of Scripture. And ſure we have as good cauſe for an implicit faith as to Scripture; as they have as to the Church. And if Mr. *Knot's* judgement be the ſenſe of the Roman Church, there is but one fundamentall point, of them actually and diſtinctly to be believed, *in which are compriſed all points by us taught to be neceſſary to ſalvation, in theſe words, we are obliged under pain of damnation to believe whatſoever the Catholick viſible Church of Chriſt propoſeth as revealed by Almighty God. If any be of another mind, all Catholicks denounce him to be no Catholick.* So he. And therefore why do they urge a particular and Inventory of all

points distinctly to be believed, when they content themselves with one Generall? If the Church must be proved by Scripture, as formerly we have shewed, and according to St. *Austin*, then one generall comprehensive point might more reasonably be sufficient for us, and that is this, we *are obliged under pain of damnation to believe* whatsoever plainly appeares to be revealed by Almighty God in Scripture. But yet we do not content our selves thus; for we say all points necessary are distinctly to be believed; and they may distinctly be believed, because they are plainly delivered; more plainly than the Decrees of Councils, at least the Trent Council. And he that says he is bound to believe all that is contained in Scripture, when clearly proposed to him as such, by consequent is ready to embrace all points necessary, because they are plainly delivered. Therefore indeed is our opinion more agreeable to a distinct account of what is to be expressely believed than theirs, because we make a distinction in point of credibility by the matter; saying, that some things are plainly proposed, because necessary to be believed, though all things are necessary to be believed when plainly proposed. The former sort whereof requires absolute belief; the latter conditionate to the competent appearance of them to be such as God hath shewed to come from him by revelation.

He proceeds. *Every one is bound not to work upon the Sunday. Every one is bound not to have two Wives at one time. Not also to marry within such or such a degree of Consanguinitie. Where are all these things plainly set down in Scripture?*

*Ans.*

*Anſ.* Some things are neither *de fide*, nor *de verbo fidei*; as that the Biſhop of *Rome* is the univerſall Biſhop of the Church. Some things are *de verbo fidei*, yet not *de fide*, in propriety of phraſe, as neceſſary in the matter; as namely hiſtoricall truths, as that Jeſus rode to *Jeruſalem*. Some things are *de verbo fidei* and *de fide* alſo, as that Jeſus is the Chriſt, that whoſoever believeth ſhall be ſaved. The queſtion now betwixt us is of the laſt kind, whether Scripture with ſufficient clearneſſe ſets down all thoſe things which are *de fide* in this ſenſe. So that my Adverſary was to prove that theſe particulars are ſo neceſſary to be believed, that no man who doth not believe them *diſtinctly* can be ſaved. And while he ſaith ſo, that they are ſuch, and doth not prove them, we need ſay no more than that he doth not prove them. *Aſſerentis eſt probare.* And I am not to anſwer unto words but Arguments. Yet ſecondly, theſe are ſufficiently knowable by Scripture, the firſt by the equity of the fourth Commandement, and the intimations thereof in the new Teſtament. The ſecond by God's own inſtitution in ſtate of innocency, and by the firſt *Ep.* to the *Cor.* 7. 2. But for fornication, let every man have his own wife, ἑαυτῦ γυναῖκα. And yet if they will hold that this is one of the practick credibles in the foreſaid neceſſity, they doe endanger the condition of thoſe Jews who had more wives. And alſo they will incurre the danger of being engaged to anſwer for that Pope, who as before, gave liberty to take another wife. And for the third it is ſufficiently declared, as to the neceſſity of knowledge and practice in *Levit.* 18. And if to the knowledge what is to be done in theſe we are ſo ſtrictly obliged by the law of God, as that if we miſſe a degree we

are damned, it must also be made as clear as whatsoever is necessary, that the law of God hath given unto the Pope a faculty and power of dispensing as to Mariages, within those degrees. If the law of God hath not made these cases of Mariage as plain as is necessary for those who are not so studious to know the utmost of their liberty, as to resolve a negative of practice upon any appearance to the contrary, then the law of God must as clearly, as to exclude doubt, shew unto us that infallible directory, whereby we may come exactly to the knowledge of what is to be done herein. And if this can be made to appear, why is it not?

Num. 5. *Other endlesse difficulties be superadded by those other words* [*plainly set down.*] *and first to prove a point plainly set down in Scripture, so that I infallibly know the undoubted true sense of it, I must first know such a book to be the true and undoubted word of God, which as I shall shew num.* 20. *cannot be known by Scripture.* This we have taken away before so far as it concerns the present dispute: and we are like to meet with it again, it seems; and no sober Christian before he had proved an infallible Propounder of every truth to be believed, would have raised this scruple. But *intellectus currit cum praxi*, as the Romanist said, religion must be accommodated for their use. To this more upon the place.

It cannot be known, *at least by those who can truely swear that they are no more able by the reading of the book of Numbers, for example, to discover in it any Divine light shewing it to be true Scripture, more than they discover in the books of* Judith *and* Tobit, *shewing them to be true Scripture.*

*Ans.*

*Anſ.* My Adverſary here was very bold, to bring into equall compare the books of *Judith* and *Tobit* with the book of *Numbers*, one book of the *Pentateuch*, as to the Autopiſty thereof. But the Jews who ſay that every letter of Scripture makes a mountain of ſenſe, could ſee more in the book of *Numbers* than in thoſe Apocryphal books. Therefore if we would reſolve the acceptance of one and the refuſall of the other into a reaſon of both, and aſk why the Jew acknowledged the book of *Numbers*, not the other, we muſt find that the acceptance of the one and the diſacceptance of the other cannot fall into the account of the Jewiſh Church its authority; becauſe the queſtion will rebound why the Jewiſh Church did authorize one and not the other. And therefore my Adverſary gets nothing by this objection: for the Church cannot be the reaſon of the approbation of the one and the preterition of the other; becauſe this difference made by the Church muſt be determined by a judicious act upon good cauſe. For do they dream that the Church hath an arbitrary power to receive one book, and to expunge another out of the Canon? Did they not excerciſe in it a judgement of diſcretion? Now he that diſcernes ſees betwixt two, and ſees cauſe why one ſhould be taken the other left. Every elective act caſts the ballance upon more weight. And therefore muſt we not take the recenſion of books canonicall from the power of the Church. And then again ſecondly, this availes not the Roman Church; becauſe, if the diſcerning of books canonicall did autocratorically depend upon the Church its declaration, yet as it is noted, not upon a particular Church, but the univerſall Church for time and place. Thirdly, the books of *Tobit* and *Judith* are not num-

numbred as Canonicall amongſt the reſt by the Canon of the Apoſtles, as *Caranza* ſets them out. And therefore, they ſaw nothing in them for their reception, and yet did in others. And if it belongs to the Church authoritatively to declare what books are Canonicall; yet cannot the Church have authority to declare more than the Apoſtles conſtituted; if they take thoſe Canons to be Canons of the Apoſtles; for otherwiſe they muſt challenge a power to the Church not only of declaring what is Canonicall, but alſo of making it ſuch; which is more than their great Doctors dare affirm. And if they will ſtill plead thoſe books Canonicall, let them anſwer it to St. *Jerom*, and St. *Cyrill* of *Jeruſalem*, and to the reſt, whom they think not to have differed from the Church, and yet have differed from them in this. But thoſe who will ſwear no difference, we may ſay, are not willing to ſee it.

*Secondly, they muſt infallibly ſhew that this very verſe in which I find this point is not thruſt in amongſt other true parts of Scripture, or ſome word changing the ſenſe either thruſt in or left out in this verſe, and this they muſt know infallibly.*

*Anſ.* Again I muſt ſay, that we are upon the ſuppoſall of Scripture; and therefore this ſhould not be called into queſtion, which is the ſubject, but this for more tediouſneſſe muſt be brought in upon all occaſions, or none. But for the uncorruptednes of the text, if they will not believe me, let them believe *Bellarmin*, as before, who denies any ſubſtantiall corruption: but then again, we are as ſure as they, for we have for it, all the authority the Church hath, if it be infallible, we have it. Again, the Scripture is corrupted, or not? If

ſo

ſo, then by the Roman Church or by ſome other. Not by the Roman Church, they will ſay: then by ſome other is it corrupted? If by any other, then firſt, how well have they been keepers of Canonicall truth? and how then ſhall we truſt them? Secondly, if corrupted, then how do they know that thoſe texts which are produced for them are not corrupted? If by the Church they know them not to be corrupted, this is the queſtion, which is to be proved, and therefore cannot yet prove it. For as they ſay we cannot know the Scripture to be infallible by the Scripture; ſo neither can we know infallibly the Church to be infallible by the Church. Though it were infallible, yet this muſt be alſo known *infallibly*, according to my Adverſaries argument. Indeed; if the word of God did leave witneſſe to its infallibility, then we are ſatisfied: but, if the texts of Scripture be corrupted, how ſhall I be ſure whether thoſe they make uſe of be not corrupted? Therefore had they beſt for ever cloſe their mouths againſt any corruption of Scripture; untill they can ſufficiently prove that the authority of the Church is *principium primo primum* in Divinity. For the teſtimony of the Church cannot exceed, of it ſelf, its *genus*. It can make no more than an high opinion; which comes ſhort of, and is too low for infallible aſſurance. But then moreover, this objection is retorted upon them. How can we be infallibly aſſured, that in the Decrees and Canons of Council there ſhould be no corruption, that one thing is not *thruſt in*, or ſomewhat *left out*; ſince we know that there was a falſification of the Nicene Council, as before? Since they have corrupted paſſages of the Fathers, as before? Since ſome words of the Decrees of the Council of Trent were changed after the vote,

as

as appear in the Hiſtory? So then in this reſpect, as in others, we may conclude, they have no reaſon to accuſe our way of uncertaintie: for we may be ſure of this, that no way is ſo full of uncertainties as theirs. If the Scripture be true, they may be a Church; if falſe, they may be Heathens. What he ſays, *Thirdly, after all this*, &c. hath in it no ſuch difficulties, as they imagin; for the words themſelves (incorrupted) do ſhew their own ſenſe, as being for the things neceſſary, ſpoken in a plain and *common* acception. And alſo their Decrees and Canons, as before, are to be ſure, more obnoxious to diverſitie of ſenſe, becauſe they were framed, at leaſt ſome of them, for ſuch a capacitie. Neither; if ſome things be expreſſed *figuratively*, doth any ſuch perplexity ariſe; becauſe the figurative expreſſion doth not oppoſe the literall ſenſe ſo much as it doth ſometimes illuſtrate it. And this kind of ſpeech as to Sacraments, in regard of the relation betwixt the ſign and the thing ſignified, is indeed naturall and proper. Though the manner of ſpeech be not proper ſimply; yet *quoad hoc*, as to Sacraments, it is proper. And my Adverſary might have taken notice that St. *Auſtin* hath noted, as before, that things darkly ſet down in one place, are to be compared with other places where they are delivered more clearly.

And therefore that which follows about the ambiguity in what ſenſe we muſt take the words, if we go *by Scripture only*, might very well have been ſpared. For, as we do not argue in Divinity from texts *myſtically* delivered, unleſſe the myſticalneſſe be rendred in Scripture: ſo we do not account thoſe texts, which are ambiguous, to be ſuch as to contain points neceſſary to ſalvation. Therefore

is

is my Adversary very wide in this discourse, because it goeth upon a supposition, that every text is necessarily to be understood and infallibly in the sense thereof. This can be denied freely without any detriment to our cause.

Might we not therefore smile at that which follows, as if we were bound *infallibly to know the secret free will of God*, for which we *must have a revelation*, or else our cause should be lost? What is this to the contradiction of us, unless we were either obliged to know infallibly all senses of all texts, or unless those texts, which contain points necessary were so doubtfull in the sense thereof. We deny both. The Scripture is in the sense. And as to points necessary, the revelation is in the words? no need of a revelation of the sense after the revelation of the words, because the sense is revealed in the words. As if when our Savior saith, *This is eternall life to know thee the onely true God, and him whom thou hast sent Jesus Christ*, we must yet have an eternall labor to find out distinctly in what sense we must take plain necessary truths. As if when our Savior commands us to *repent and believe*, we had need of another revelation or an infallible Judge to tell us in what sense we must take the words. As if when our Saviour says, that he hath *revealed these things to babes*, we must go to the Holy Father of *Rome*, and the Fathers of a Councill for an uncontrolable exposition of *these things*. If then by the *secret free will of God*, Gods purposes of binding us in our obedience; that, as to things necessary, is revealed in the termes. His *voluntas signi*, as they speak, as to these things necessary, is plainly delivered; and otherwise the expression were not good, if we needed another revelation of the sense. Indeed the *voluntas bene*

*placiti*, as to his actions, that needs a revelation; but what is this to our purpose? The former *will*, how he would expresse himself, was *free* to him before he did reveal himself in such writings: but afterwards it was determined by the plain signification of the words, as to those matters of faith. And where do they *find this revelation in Scripture*, that we must go to the Church for a revelation of the sense of difficult texts? Yea, of those texts which concern the Church? How shall we know whether those texts be rightly interpreted, and know it infallibly? Not by the Church: For the question is of the Church. Not by a revelation made to particular persons: for then we might have a revelation of other texts in the sense of them. Therefore must they say they are plain. And if so, then so may other texts be, especially such as respect necessity to salvation.

Therefore when we have tried all ways, as to faith we must center in Scripture. And let them think upon that of Christ to St. *Paul*, πανεῖ τῆς κλίσεα λαπτίζων.

What he says *Fourthly*, I have little to say to. The authorites of *Sanctius* and *Sharpius*, which he produceth, are more for my advantage than his. For my Adversary confesseth, that *learned Sanctius* confesseth, *that holy Scripture in those things which are necessary, is clear*. Secondly, as for the *nineteen rules* which he gives, *as necessary to the knowledge thereof*; this may respect other texts of Scripture which do not contemn necessary points. Thirdly, if those rules be intended as to the knowledge of what is necessary to salvation, (and not to the knowledge of Scripture in generall) yet the difficulty must not be great even by those rules: for how then can Scripture be clear,

as

as to things neceſſary? Yea, alſo St. *Auſtin* gives rules for the underſtanding of Scripture, and yet holds, that Scripture, as to faith and manners, plainly delivers things neceſſary, as before. Neither is it neceſſary for our cauſe to exclude the uſe of means for the underſtanding of Scripture even in things neceſſary. It is ſufficient to us, that by the uſe of means, thoſe texts are ſo plain as that we have no need of an external infallible Judge. But we can admit with *Sharpius* the means he names, *to know originall Languages, to diſcuſſe the words, Phraſes and Ebraiſms, to confer the places which are like and unlike to one another*; as to the underſtanding of Scripture, *de communi*; and they are neceſſary: but he cannot mean theſe rules to be neceſſary for the underſtanding of every truth in Scripture. And therefore, if his authority were ſufficient, yet cannot this he ſays be effectuall to prove a neceſſity of all theſe means, as to the finding out of the ſenſe of thoſe texts wherein neceſſary truths are laid down. That Jeſus is the Chriſt; that whoſoever believeth ſhall be ſaved; that there is a neceſſity of good works, are truths ſo plain, as he that cannot uſe thoſe means, may plainly diſcern: and therefore need we not the help of thoſe rules, as *to produce infallibility*. To be even then with my Adverſary for theſe authorities we may alſo urge as the Arch Biſhop of *Collen*, who as before reformed his Church by the rule of Scripture, ſo alſo the Cardinall of *Rocheſter*, who in the Trent Council ſaid, *It was better to take for our ground the Scripture, whence true Theology is taken; than the ſubtilties of Philoſophy which the Schools have uſed*. Hiſt. Trent Counc. *Pag.* 197.8. And add hereunto the uncertainties of the ſenſe of a Council, as appears by conteſt of *Soto* and *Viga*, Hiſt. Tr. Counc. 216.

As for the *saying of that so much esteemed* Chillingworth, which he adds, *fifthly*, namely, *no more certain sign that a point is not evident, than when honest & understanding and indifferent men, & such as give themselves liberty of judgment after mature consideration of the matter, do differ about.* Unto which he subsumes, *About how many points do you and your Brethren differ, which I have in this chap. shewed to be points* mainly *necessary to salvation, which according to this rule of knowing what is evident, what not, are evidently not set down plainly in Scripture?* What comes this to, but a confusion? For Mr. *Chillingworth* gives us the *Maxim*, and my Adversary makes the assumption upon presumption, that he hath proved many things to be differed about which he saith he hath *shewed to be necessary to salvation*. By Mr. *Chillingworth's* rule those points should not be necessary, because we differ about them. But my Adversary would fain prove, it may be, that Mr. *Chillingworth's* rule is false. If it be false, how can he use it against me? If it be not false, then it concludes more against him, however, till he proves our differences to be about necessaries, his discourse hath neither forme; nor truth, upon his part.

Some twelve lines of this number he imploys in repetitions, and references to the fourth chap. His repetitions have been answered in the matter, his References are referred to their place.

Num. 6. That which follows concerning texts which he thinks are for him, that *the very reading of them sheweth them to be no lesse plain and clear to this purpose than those places which you cry out to be evident for the proof of every point which is necessary to salvation*, me thinks doth somewhat enterfair upon what he had said before, that we could not

not underſtand *God's free will* how to mean his own words *without a revelation*. For now thoſe texts, which they fanſie for them, by the very reading of them, ſhew themſelves to be as clear as thoſe which *we cry out to be ſo evident*; we ſay ſo plain. So then ſome degree of clearneſs there may be in words without a revelation of the ſenſe; ſince God hath no mentall reſervation. And if they grant ſome clearneſſe, as it is neceſſary they muſt for thoſe texts which concern the Church, then ſurely there may be more than they grant. Secondly, will they ſay, that thoſe texts, they urge for the Church, are as clear for the Roman Church in point of infallibility, as this propoſition is, whoſoever believes ſhall be ſaved? Dare they ſay it γυμνῇ κεφαλῇ? We can prove the contrary by their own argument; that about which there is more difference is not ſo clear: there is more difference about the texts for the Church; therefore thoſe not ſo clear. Therefore alſo let them no more object our differences: for our differences from them prove well that their way is not plain, and their differences amongſt themſelves prove better that their way is not plain. And our differences amongſt our ſelves do prove onely that thoſe points wherein we differ are not plain; but do not prove that thoſe points that are neceſſary are not plain; becauſe in them we do not or need not to differ. Thirdly, are thoſe texts for them no more plain than our texts for things neceſſary to ſalvation? If not, then where is the ground of their infallibility. For the texts are not clear for it: are they? If they be, then our texts for neceſſaries to ſalvation are, I hope, as clear, then what need of a Judge infallible? And why then do they not as well believe the points neceſſary to ſalvation upon ac-

account of Scripture as they do the point of infallibility? Well, but our texts being not clear ſufficiently of themſelves, the authority of the Church adds clearneſſe: doth it? Yea, but this is more improperly affirmed, if they do ſay ſo, than they think of: for the judgement of the Church is more influxive into the clearneſſe of it as to us, than their authority. They firſt ſee the ſenſe of the texts, before they do declare it by their authority. For if this be the ſenſe becauſe they declare it ſo, and they do not declare it to be the ſenſe, becauſe they ſee it diſcuſſively to be the ſenſe; then God, inſpiring the Pen-men of Scripture intended but the words of Scripture, and that the Church ſhould give us the ſoul, the ſenſe, the Kernell of Scripture. And why then did the Trent Councill make Scriptures the chief rule, as they ſay, of their proceedings, if they did not determine of points and actions by their diſcerning the mind of God in the Scripture, as to thoſe particulars? So then alſo, if their diſcerning of the ſenſe of Scripture was ſubſtrated to their definitions, then the Scripture is diſcernible in the ſenſe to us alſo. Fourthly, if thoſe texts, he names, be no clearer than thoſe we ſay which are neceſſary to ſalvation; then let them never endeavour by Scripture to perſwade any to their Religion. For if the texts be no clearer for the Church, than points in Scripture are, as to neceſſity of ſalvation, then ſurely the Argument is equall on both ſides; and then there is by Scripture no neceſſity clear of an infallible Judge.

But he prefers his texts in clearneſſe to ours in the following words. *And I am ſure you can bring no ſuch evident texts for all, yea, or for any of theſe points which I have already ſaid in this ch.*

*ch. not to be evidently ſet down in Scripture though they be of prime neceſſity, as others alſo which I will by and by add.* The uſe of this to me is this, to ſay that the ſame was ſaid before, yet alſo we can note that he ſhould have preferred the clearneſſe of thoſe texts for the Church before the clearneſſe of thoſe points which we confeſſe to be neceſſary to ſalvation; but he prefers it before thoſe which we either deny or queſtion to be neceſſary. If any one ſhould ſay this were a Sophiſters trick, I could not tell how to deny it. And yet alſo further we ſay, if thoſe texts which are for the Church are ſo plain, then *a fortiori*, thoſe texts which are for points neceſſary muſt be more plain; and my reaſon is this, becauſe theſe are neceſſary for the being of a Member of the Church inviſible, thoſe for the Church, onely neceſſary for the being of a Member of the Church viſible. Now there is a greater neceſſity of the former than there is of the latter: for as before, it is poſſible to be ſaved without the finding of a regular viſible Church; but it is not poſſible for any to be ſaved who is not a Member of the inviſible. Yea, again he doth not ſpeak according to the mind of Mr. *Knot*, in ſaying texts for the Church are ſo evident, for one of the qualities of the object of faith, ſhould be, according to him, that it is obſcure; that ſo it may be capable of the obedience of faith. But to end this, we onely note more the ſlavery of the Romaniſt; in that he is bound to be ſo diſ-ingenuous as to hold the texts of Scripture to be ſo clear only for the Church, which they interpret the Roman. But alſo herein they do not differ from all other ſects, which they ſo much upbraid, that texts for them are clear, if any other. And we have the benefit of it (whom he takes to be a Sect) til

Ch. 6. againſt Dr. *Pott.*

till he ſhews the Contrary. But the Scripture doth *far more clearly ſet down a Command to goe to the Church for our full inſtruction. So St.* Paul *was taught all things neceſſary for his knowledge by thoſe few words. (Acts the 9. 6.) Goe into the City, and it ſhall be told thee what thou muſt doe.*

*Anſ.* And have they no better Arguments, St. *Paul* was commanded to go into the City, and there it ſhould be told him what he muſt do; therefore we muſt go to the City of *Rome* and there we ſhall know all things neceſſary to ſalvation. So then. As the Cardinall *Richlieu* was flattered by a great ſervant of his, that God needed not to have extended his Providence to the lower world; but he might have left that to the Governance of the Cardinall: ſo God needed not to have indited by his Spirit any more of Scripture than only to lead us infallibly to the Church. Go to the City of *Rome*, and there *it will be told* us *what muſt be done*, in order to life everlaſting. Chriſt might have laid aſide the care of his Church; & might have devolved that to his Vicar. If we would ſay any thing to ſuch a reaſoning, we might ſay, firſt, he ſhould have ſhewed us as fair a warrant for going to the City of *Rome*, as St. *Paul* had to go to the City. Secondly, he was ſent into the City to know what was to be done; not *known*: for St. *Paul* denies to have had his Doctrine from man. *Gal.* 1. 11, 12. Thirdly, this direction he was to have from *Ananias*, was rather in order to his Function than to his ſalvation. Fourthly, *Ananias* was extroardinarily inſpired and indued with a power of Miracles for the reſtitution of his ſight. But is the Pope thus? Can he give the Holy Ghoſt, as *Ananias* did; Indeed he may ordain;

dain; but can he give the Holy Ghoſt as *Ananias* did? At leaſt, can he give ſight? he can ſooner take it away. If we being blind ſhould take the guidance of ſuch a Prophet, he would lead us into *Samaria*, and not ſet bread before us.

Indeed Pope *Anacletus* (according to *Carranza*) tels us in the end of his firſt Epiſtle, that *the Apoſtles did eſtabliſh this by the Command of our Lord and Savior, that greater and more difficult queſtions ſhould be referred to the Apoſtolick ſea, upon which Chriſt did build his univerſall Church (univerſam Eccleſiam) when he ſaid tu es Petrus, &c.* But when theſe Epiſtles are proved genuine; and then binding in his own cauſe, and when the Pope (who hath the ſame power) ſhall have determined the difficult queſtion (which *Carranza* puts off) betwixt St. *Jerom* and others, whether *Anacletus* was predeceſſor to *Clement*; and when it ſhall be made good that Chriſt gave to St. *Peter* univerſall power over the univerſall Church, and not onely power over every Church, as to the reſt of the Apoſtles (as it was diſtinguiſhed in the Trent Council) and when they ſhall have anſwered St. *Cyprian*, who ſays the Church was founded, not *ſuper Petrum*, but *ſuper Petram, voce Domini*; in the 8. *Ep.* of the 1. *b.* then we may be in greater neceſſity to ſay more to this inſtance

*That all might ſee this City of the Church, he placed it on a mountain, whence all neceſſary points are delivered from a living Oracle ſpeaking ſo diſtinctly, that no doubt can remain of the true ſenſe; or, if there be made any doubt of any thing of importance, this doubt will preſently be cleared by ſome new declaration authentically notified unto us by our Paſtors and Doctors, which God gave us (as the*

*Scripture ſaith) that we ſhould not be children wavering and carried about with the wind of falſe Doctrine with circumvention of error*, We have put all in for weight: we ſhall anſwer now diſtinctly. Firſt, as to the mountain; we muſt know what mountain this is upon which the City of the Church was built. Whether the mount *Gerezzin*, or whether is mount *Eball*, how ſhall we know? And which are the Samaritans and which the Hieroſolymitans, how ſhall we diſcern? We muſt yet wander upon the Mountains to know which mountain is the right. Each will claim the Priviledge of a *living Oracle*. Therefore if we were to take our reſolves of all *neceſſary points* from the Church, we were yet to ſeek which is the true Church. And ſo the prime neceſſary would be uncertain, namely, which ſhould be our infallible Propounder and Reſolver of all neceſſary points. How ſhall we reſolve this capitall and cardinall Controverſie which is the right Church, the Mother and Miſtriſſe of all Churches? Yea, the queſtion is yet to be agitated and determined infallibly whether there is to be any ſuch, it is not yet proved, but my Adverſary here ſeems to ſuppoſe it. Well; give it, not grant it in the *theſis*, that there is ſuch a Church. How ſhall it be made beyond all queſtion, that this or this is the Church for the *Hypotheſis*? Whether *Jeruſalem*, or *Antioch*, or *Alexandria*, or *Conſtantinople*, or *Rome* is the City of that Church how ſhall we be aſcertained infallibly? Muſt the City be built upon a hill in the letter? Then indeed there might be ſome diſcovery: and yet more Cities are ſo built, and therefore no certainty. And *Rome* hath too many hills to be a topicall argument that it is the ſeat of Chriſt: ſeven hills are rather topicall for

for Antichriſt, as in the revelation. Secondly, if the Church be as faſt to a place as the Heathen gods to their Temples, muſt the Church by vertue of the place always have the ſame priviledges in the *zenith*? So then if the Roman Church was ſo faithfull, as that for a time, they did flow to it for direction in doubtfull caſes; muſt it always be as the Oracular Virgin? Will *Caſſander* believe it that *Caſſandra* was always ſo clear in her Oracles? What ſays *Lycophron*?

——— ἡ γὰρ ἀνυμφεύτου κόρη
Ἕλυσι χρησμῶν, οὓς πέλει, ἀδόλους σέμα·
Ἀλλ' ἀσαφῆ χέουσα παιπαλωτὰ βάθη,
Δαφνηφάγος φοιβάζει ἐν λαμπῶν ὄπα.

And thirdly, may we not as well take Gods direction, to go to the Scripture? Is not the word of God an *Oracle*? Let him ſpeak as the Oracles of God, 1 *Pet.* 4. 11. Were not the Scriptures of the old Teſtament the Oracles of God, *Rom.* 3. 2.? To them were committed the Oracles of God. Have we not a generall command, *to the Law and to the Teſtimony? If they ſpeak not according to this word, it is becauſe there is no light in them*, *Eſ.* 8. 20. There is light in the Law and the Teſtimony always: but there is not always light in them that would direct without or beſide them. But the word they will ſay is not a *living Oracle*. But the word is an Oracle, and it is a living word, as before in the *Hebrews*. And the living God ſpeaks to us in this written Oracle. And therefore untill we ſee in this written Oracle, that we have and are bound to a *living Oracle*, my Adverſary ſays nothing. Thirdly, we deny, that his *living Oracle* ſuppoſed ſpeaks *ſo diſtinctly, that no doubt can remain of the true ſenſe*. This is ſufficiently declared before in the Ambi-

biguous decrees of the Council of Trent. So that indeed their living Oracle ſpeaks after the old ſort of the Heathen Oracles, as *Loxias* did, ſo as to preſerve truth in one ſenſe or other. Each party thought that the Oracle ſpake for him. As he to *Ulyſſes*——*Aut erit aut non* they are within one of a true prophecy, yea, theſe Roman Oracles have a true ſenſe in them, but we know not which. Well then alſo; as for *neceſſary points* we ſay fourthly, as before, that we have no need of *a living* Oracle, becauſe the Scripture ſpeaks ſo plainly and ſo *diſtinctly, that no doubt can* juſtly *remain of the true ſenſe.* And what needs more, as to ſalvation? Yea alſo it ſpeaks plainly, and ſo diſtinctly unto many other profitable points, as that *no doubt can remain of the true ſenſe.* And fifthly, whereas they ſay, *or if there be made any doubt of any thing of importance, &c.* this new peice takes off from the old, and makes the rent worſe: for if the living Oracle ſpeaks ſo *diſtinctly, that no doubt can remain of the true ſenſe*, then what need of any further proviſion for doubts emergents, as if they durſt not truſt their own principles. And again, if they can aſſoile all doubts that ſhall ariſe; why do they not? why, ſince the Trent Council, hath there been no other to explain the ſenſe of the former in ſeverall particulars? that which was never done and yet would be of ſuch uſe is morally reputed for an impoſſibility; as St. *Jerom* diſputed againſt the Pelagians. This would prove wilfull ignorance in the Church Repreſentative. And therefore cannot we be obliged to follow it abſolutely: for it ſeems ſometimes it will not lead us. And if they ſay that we may well be ſaved without the infallible dejudication of the ſenſe of perplexed

plexed terms; why do they then include in the caſe a *thing of importance?* Yea, and alſo we can then by their allowance ſay, we may be ſafely ignorant of ſome points which are not of *importance* to ſalvation: and therefore are in a capacity good enough to give the negative to a Judge infallible.

Nay, ſixthly, neither can the doubt *be preſently cleared by ſome new Declaration authentically notified unto us by our Paſtors and Doctors.* Not preſently, firſt, becauſe a Councill muſt be called which the Roman Church will be well adviſ of before, and if it coſts them as much time to conſider of it and to diſpatch it as the Trent Council, this *preſently* will not come within forty years, and more. And if he ſays the preſent Pope can preſently deliver the ſenſe, and notify it *authentically*; then why ſays he it may be done by *Paſtors and Doctors?* Why doth he ſpeak in the number of plurality to the prejudice of the one Authoritative Paſtor? Well, it may be, he means Paſtors and Doctors, in common, can *authentically* notifie us the ſenſe; then private Doctors may be authentick, which ſpoils all; and is contrary to Jeſuit and Roman Catholicks (as they call themſelves) in generall: and to his own opinion, who placeth all authority and infallibility in a Council confirmed by the Pope. For we are bound they ſay, to the ſenſe of the Decrees: then if private Doctors and Paſtors can authentically notifie us the ſenſe, then are we bound to them. Yea, and alſo why may not then our private Paſtors and Doctors declare to us the ſenſe of doubtfull texts, as well as theirs; and then why an infallible Judge? Yea, can private Paſtors and Doctors authentically notifie us the ſenſe;

and

and not the infallible Judge? If he can, why doth he not? If he will not, how shall we take him for our Guide? They have determined the words of their definitions, but have either not determined or determined not to determine the acception and sense: but that must be left for Pastors and Doctors.

And therefore seventhly and lastly, he had better have not have produced these passages in reference to those texts. For God gave us *Pastors and Doctors*; then not onely one Pastor of the Church, as the high Romanist accounts; who makes all others to be as his Curates in all the universall Church. Why then doth one arrogate that which in common is assigned to more? *Calvin* in his *Comment* upon the Epistle to *Titus*, thinks it unreasonable, that the name of Bishop, which is common to many, should be appropriated to one, though he denies not there the superiority of one to the rest of the Clergy: and my Adversary would have the action of a Pastor authentically to be common to many, whereas the title others would have proper to one, and to be given to the rest but analogically. This text then by my Adversaries exposition derogates from the ordinary and universall Pastor, because it allowes his priviledge to many. But then again, he commits a fallacy of division, in attributing the end to a part which is applied to the whole: for it is said there, And he gave some Apostles; some Prophets; some Evangelists; some Pastors and Teachers; for the perfecting of the Saints, the work of the Ministry. They are all given complexively for that end, and he takes it distributively and of the last. As if all faith were to be resolved into the dictates of Pastors and Teachers where-

as

as the Church is built upon the foundation of the Apoſtles and Prophets, Jeſus Chriſt himſelf being the chief Corner ſtone, *Eph.* 2. 20. Yea, and again, there is to be made a difference between the Paſtors and Doctors then and now, there having been then better gifts given to them than now, and they having been then nearer the fountain of Evangelicall truth than now: and therefore though the office is continued, it is not neceſſary, that when the Chriſtian Church hath been ſo long ſetled, there ſhould be ſuch perfection in the ſucceſſors. *Diſtingue tempora*, as the rule is.

His ſeventh number might well have been ſpared: for he ſeems to charge me with not doing what in the eight number he ſays I go about to do. Only whereas he ſays for me, that *the Scriptures taken by themſelves all alone do teach us with infallibility all things neceſſary to ſalvation*: the terms may admit a diſtinction. If he takes the terms *all alone* ſo as to be underſtood contradiſtinctly to an infallible Judge, ſo we ſtand to them, if he takes them ſo as to exclude all uſe of Paſtors and Doctors, ſo are not we bound to them, we can in our opinion exclude the infallible Judge without excluſion to the direction of Paſtors and Teachers; which although not exempted from poſſibility of error, yet may alſo be conſulted even in texts ſufficiently plain. Beſides, as he ſtates the point for us, that *the Scriptures taken by themſelves all alone do teach us with infallibility all things neceſſary to ſalvation*, we can eaſily ſubſcribe unto, upon another diſtinction, which we have in metaphyſick about the τὸ ἀπλῶς, that the unapprehenſiveneſſe of them doth more proceed from the weakneſſe of the faculty, than the nature Num. 7.

of

of the things themſelves: ſo the Scriptures by themſelves alone do teach us with infallibility all things neceſſary; although we were not able to perceive infallibly the ſenſe of them. All things neceſſary yet are infallibly taught there; and therefore this ſerves to the evacuation of their *verbum non ſcriptum*; becauſe that this is not pretented for the clearing of Scripture, but for the ſupply of matter defective.

Num. 8. To come now to the diſcuſſion of the texts. *And firſt, you preſſe the ſecond time that of St.* Paul *to* Tim. 2. 15, 16. And here he ſays, *Take for my firſt Anſwer that which I gave you when you firſt alleadged this place, ch.* 1. *num.* 13. *And you muſt pardon me if I ſay* that which he had ſaid before. But how can I take it for full ſatisfaction, that before, I am referred to the third chap. and here we are ſent back again to the place from whence he came, This, if we might ſay ſo, is plain bo peep. He hath my anſwer there which is yet good. *The Scriptures thus Profaned and by ſuch interpretations truely diſcanoned (as I may ſay) are rather ſubject to that effect which St.* Pauls *Epiſtles (according to St.* Peter) *had with ſome men,* i.e. *they are ſubject to be depraved by them to the perdition of their Interpreters.*

But what is this to us? And yet will they ſay, becauſe men are ſubject to deprave the Scripture, therefore is Scripture ſubject to be depraved? And after the ſame manner that the Scriptures may be *diſcanoned* by ſuch interpretations, ſo may alſo the Decrees of the Councils, if men have a greater reverence of the Decrees and Canons of Councils than of the Holy Scriptures. And if Scripture be *diſcanoned* by a falſe ſenſe, then Scripture is canoned by a true; and ſo then by giving a true ſenſe

of

of Scripture, the Church should make Scripture; which yet is denied by the learnedst Pontificians. And also if we must put upon Scripture the corruptions of men, as he doth by a fallacy of accident, then have we lesse reason to esteem of Scripture by the authority of men.

*Where by the way you are again to take notice, &c.* unto *it was then true.* To that which he says here we answer again, (since he will have it so) that the act of wresting Scripture is damnative; not by the error of the understanding, but by the perverseneſſe of the will; whatsoever the matter of that Scripture be, whether necessary or not. And he does well to conclude for us, *Consequently these places did not (according to your Doctrine) contain points necessary to salvation*, namely, *because they were hard.* It is right, yet not because they were wrested they did not contain points necessary; for points necessary may possibly also be wrested: but rather because they were hard to be understood. Points hard to be understood are more like to be wrested, than points wrested hard to be understood. And the *perdition* follows not upon the ignorance of the things not necessary, but upon the depravation of the texts. And therefore our *allowance* of some *liberty of interpretations even in hard points, may* not *easily prove* damnable. First, the liberty is not so much allowed as necessary. Secondly, the liberty is not damnable, but the abuse. Thirdly, the *allowance* is not so much to *hard points*, but things plain, where the Lamb may wade. Fourthly, it is necessary that the people should know that which is necessary to be known: it is accidentall that they should mis-interpret the text which doth not contain that which is necessary. Now shall he be

deprived of that which is neceſſary, upon a contingent inconvenience; which alſo, if he hath a ſober mind, cannot betide him? *Felix periculum in neceſſariis. Sapiens non curat de accidentalibus.*

*It was then true which I told you in another place, that though the Scripture be a moſt right rule, yet it is very commonly ſo crookedly applied, that we ſtand in need of a better ſecurity of the Interpretation of it (in which the very kernell of the letter doth conſiſt) than we have of the Interpretation (finally ſtood unto) made by the private judgement of our own diſcretion.*

*Anſ.* My Adverſary, by his fallacy of accident, is falling upon another queſtion, namely, this, whether it be not dangerous to let men have the free uſe of Scripture: which although it ſeems to conclude for him, yet doth not punctually conclude againſt me in the particular point of Controverſie, namely, whether the Scripture doth plainly deliver things neceſſary. As it is ſaid by ſome, that ſome Hares when they are hotly hunted will ſquatt before another hare, to put the Hunters upon a new chaſe: ſo he would ſtart as it were another queſtion to put me off from the proſecution of the right queſtion. But ſecondly, we will follow this alſo: and we ſay that he here grants as much as which extenſively concludes againſt him. For if the Scripture be a *moſt right rule*, as he confeſſeth, then are we to be ruled by it. Let me aſk, why did God give us *this moſt right rule*? what, to be laid aſide, becauſe by ſome it is *crookedly aplied*? Is this a good conſequence? Becauſe the authority of the Church hath been urged by Hereticks; therefore we ſhould not urge the Authority of the Church. Becauſe the Goſpel doth

doth harm to some by their corruption, therefore we should not have it preached. Because *Dudithius*, the Bishop of five Churches, said of the Trent Council, that the Holy Ghost had nothing to do with the Council, and that he was carried in a Carriers Rortmantle to Trent, and that the Spirit of God which moved upon the waters could not come to Trent, because the waters were up; therefore we must not make use of Councils for the ending of Controversies. Such consequenses his argumentation affords; let them own these, or retract their reasoning. Thirdly, where shall we have a *better security of the Interpretation of it?* Let them first secure a better security of the Interpretation of it. It is true, if the Interpretation of a Council be compared with the Interpretation of a *private judgement*, it is probable that the Interpretation of a Council should be better, but the question is, whether we can have security for faith by the Interpretation of a Council. This we deny, since Councils may possibly erre in the Interpretations of some texts; and particularly the Trent Council did err in some Interpretations, as some of the Divines therein have signified. And then fourthly, he doth freely or inconsiderately mistake our cause in the allowances we give to the private judgement of discretion: for we do not say that we should *finally stand to* our private Interpretation, either as to determine others thereby, or to prefer our own Interpretation before that publick judgement of a Council; but this we say, that the sense of Scripture cannot be obtruded to us as to believe it upon their account, unlesse we see good reason out of Scripture for it. The *private judgement of*

*discretion* hath not it self in this case, as in a contrary competition to the Council; but hath it self negatively, and is upon the suspense, till it sees Gods word for it.

But he knew my answer, as it seems. *I know your answer is, that you accidentall to this rule to be misapplied, and that cannot infringe the authority of Scripture.* Yes, this was in substance my answer before. But now it will not serve, as my Adversary would perswade me by his distinction. *It doth not indeed infringe the authority of Scripture used as God would have it used, with due submission to the publick Interpretation of the Church. Otherwise, &c. unto neither.*

*Ans.* He means private judgement of discretion doth *not infringe the authority of the Scripture used as God would have it used*: but the misapplication of it (which he should have spoken to) doth *infringe the authority of the Scripture so used.* So we see he did not discourse properly. But secondly, he seems here to make nothing almost of Scripture unless *used with due submission to the publick Interpretation of the Church.* And this also in effect begs the question, whether we cannot make use of Scripture well, as unto necessaries, without submission to the publick Interpretation of the Church; and also again it begs the question, whether we are bound to stand to no sense of Scripture without submission to the publick Interpretation of the Church. Yea, thirdly, we may also *crookedly* apply the determinations of the Church, as hath been shewed *de facto*; and therefore why doth he argue against the use of Scripture as the rule because it may yet be *crookedly applied*? This argument is to us common with them: we can use it against the Church, as they

they uſe in againſt Scripture and therefore this cannot determine our particular Controverſie. Yea, fourthly, the Scripture which is acknowledged by my Adverſary *a moſt right rule*, is a rule to the Church too, is it not? If not, then have they no Divine authority to ſhew for the authority of the Church: if ſo, then we can make uſe of Scripture without the authority of the Church, becauſe we make uſe of Scripture for the authority of the Church. *Omne per accidens reducitur ad aliquid per ſe.* So we may make uſe of Scripture by it ſelf; and therefore the authority of Scripture may be infringed without reſpect to the authority of the Church. And therefore all he ſays comes to nothing, unleſſe he proves two points. Firſt, that Scripture needs an infallible Interpreter for things neceſſary: The ſecond this, that *God doth provide us of an infallible Interpreter* with infallible knowledge who it is.

*Neither is this to ſpeak more irreverently of Scripture than St.* Peter *ſpake of St.* Paul's *Epiſtles.* He ſays, the Scripture is a *moſt right rule*: good. He ſays, it is infallible: good. He ſays he ſpeaks no more irreverently of it, than St. *Peter* ſpake of St. *Paul's* Epiſtles: good. Good words. and we give good words for his good words. But doth St. *Peter* put in the authority of the publick Interpretation of the Church to be neceſſary to the right applying of St. *Paul's* Epiſtles? This did not St. *Peter*. Did he ſay that St. *Paul's* Epiſtles doth not plainly contain any thing neceſſary to ſalvation? this did not St. *Peter*. Did he ſay, that St. *Paul* ſaies in his Epiſtles, that the Church is our infallible Guide, and the way ſo plain that fools cannot err? This did not St. *Peter*. Did he ſay all things were ſo hard to be underſtood in

St.

St. *Paul's* Epiſtles? This did not St. *Peter*. If they will believe him without the atteſtation of his ſucceſſor, let them conſider what he ſays in his 2. *Ep.* 1. *ch.* 19, 20, 21. *ver. We have alſo a more firm word of Prophecy*. More firm, or moſt firm; as ſometimes the Comparative for the Superlative. More firm ſurely than the Church (which in part, is built upon it, as St. *Paul*) *Whereunto ye doe well that ye take heed as to a light ſhining in a dark place, &c.* And if a light ſhining in a dark place, then it hath not ſuch need of an infallible Interpreter: we ſee light by itſelf. It is not ſo dark and obſcure as my Adverſary would have it: for it is a light ſhining in a dark place. And certainly if that a light and ſhining in a dark place, then the whole new Teſtament is a light ſo clear and ſufficient as that we need not the help of an infallible Judge either to this light; or in this light. And can it be well immagined that Scripture, *being not of private exhibition or delivery, becauſe Prophecy came not of old time by the will of man, but holy men ſpake as they were moved by the Holy Ghoſt*; can it be imagined that this ſhould be by the Holy Ghoſt ſo obſcurely or ambiguouſly propoſed, as that we muſt have neceſſity of a living Judge to make the ſenſe of it ſufficiently plain to ſalvation? If the Holy Ghoſt can clearly give us the ſenſe as ſpeaking by his Church, could he not as plainly give us the ſenſe as when he ſpake by the Prophets? Have we need of another Prophecy and Revelation of the ſenſe? But it ſeems by them God muſt accomodate the ſtile of Scripture for the uſe of the Roman Church, and muſt invelope it in cloudy difficulties, that we muſt go to *Rome* to ſee the Sun of Righteouſneſſe ſhining there, as in *Delos*, without a cloud.

And

And this also is enough to answer what follows, which is so much out of the way, because we cannot find our question in it, whether things necessary are plainly contained in Scripture. For what is this to it, that *nothing more clear than that the words of Scripture are capable of severall senses?* If he means in all Texts, he is as easily contradicted, nothing more clear than that some *words of Scripture are* not *capable of severall senses.* If he means of some: what is this to the *Elench?* We can say some words are capable of severall senses consistently to this, that things necessary are plain. And as to his question, *how shall we infallibly know Gods secret intention* (in which sense, or whether in *both* he intended them) *but by an Interpreter having infallible assistance from the same Holy Spirit, who assisted those who did write the Scriptures?* We answer, first, as before, it toucheth not the question unless it be applied to *words* which speak of necessaries to salvation: and then we deny it, that such texts are so perplexed. Secondly, some texts we may take in divers senses not contrary. Thirdly, as he hath not proved to us an infallible Judge: so here he doth not prove a need of an infallible Interpreter; unless he could prove that it is necessary to salvation, that we should know the intended sense of every doubtfull passage in Scripture. Neither again fourthly, (for they shall have it *toties quoties*) the definitions of the Councils are, some of them, *ex composito*, so framed, as that we do not clearly see the intention of the Council in what *sense* or *whether in both the words* should be taken. And must we not then, according to my Adversary, have another infallible Interpreter of them? And if they deliver not the thing clear, then another infallible Interpreter

of

of them? and if they deliver not the thing clear, then another infallible Interpreter of them: and so *in infinitum*. And if they say, it is not necessary in points of question indubitably to decide in plain terms which part is to be held, then we ask why they do not allow a latitude to us: since the Council by them is intended for a remedy. And therefore need we not again say, that we do not give *so much scope to such poor creatures as ignorant men are*. They have but their rational liberty to find the way of Salvation in the Scripture, unto which it was appointed, in things doubtfull, we say they should consult with learned men. We do not *invest them with so ample a faculty to interpret it without any interiour submission to the Church*. They take their own freedom and right to see reason why they should submit to the Church, either as clearing the sense, or proving its infallibility. They are bound to see good reason why they differ from the Church; but they are not simply bound to believe upon whatsoever reason the Church gives or none. Neither doe we say, that he may *stand out in his judgement against the Interpretations of whole Generall Councils*; not stand out in an heady opposition, but yet may say, *Salvo meliori judicio*, that he must see how, what they define be correspondent to Scripture, in points of belief. Secondly, how shall poor ignorant creatures know what severall Generall Councils have agreed in, since some have differed from others, as hath been seen? They must know by infallibility that the Councils have defined this; and then that they have defined it infallibly. And so they put poor ignorant men upon greater difficulties. And if it be said that the ignorant men should believe the Church, that such a point is defined by the

the Councils: it is answered, no: we are to believe, according to my Adversary, the Church onely as it is infallible; and that is in Councils confirmed by the Pope. Thirdly, if the Church be the way for poor ignorant creatures, because of the difficulty (pretended) of Scripture; yet as to learned men, it seems it is not necessary that it should be the way to them, because to them, being so learned, the Scripture is not so difficult: and therefore upon the matter, we may conclude, that it is more reasonable, that ignorant men should goe the way which learned men should goe in, than that learned men should go the way which fools and ignorant men go in.

So then that which my Adversary says after, immediately, needs not be traduced, *And yet this very self same man is wisely by you sent to the Minister. Any Minister of the Gospell, say you (but) I must not say any Generall Council is able competently through the Scripture to direct the people to their happinesse.* This, and more of this kind he hath with some undue reflexion upon his Adversary with an Ironie; but if all be weighed, and the reflexion not weighed, all will come to not much. For, first, I never gave him occasion to think that I preferred the judgement of a single Minister before the judgement of a generall Council. But that which I said, if he would have taken notice of it, doth infer a great deal of respect to the faculty of a generall Council. For if I say that a single Minister may competently inform us of so much as is necessary; then much more a generall Council. And this is implyed in the words of him that doth give a due respect to Councils. Secondly, he might also have remembred that this use

of a Minister of the Gospel was spoken upon occasion of the text, or may be grounded thereupon, that *the Scriptures were able to make wise unto salvation*; therefore upon the place it is to be restrained to things necessary to salvation, which doe not need so judicious a debate of a Generall Councill; because there is no such difficulty in the sense of them. If I say that my Adversary could have told us, that the authority of the Church is in the Pope and a Councill, do I prefer my Adversary before a Pope and a Councill, or a Councill and a Pope; (for it is a mighty question which is superior, since they have no mind to be ruled by the Councill of *Constance*?). And if I say, my Adversary could have satisfied such a scruple about the number of Orders, do I say that my Adversary could have assoyled all doubts in Theology as well as a generall Councill? I did not speak of a Minister exclusively to a Councill in their judgement and authority; but exclusively rather to a Councill in the necessity thereof. And this sets the accent upon the Councill, *ex abundanti*. Therefore he doth not drive the compare *ad idem*: for I spoke of the ability of a Minister as to things necessary, which are sufficiently plain of themselves: he brings me in speaking of a Minister, as to things of question which are not necessary: and this therefore is not logically done; for comparation must be in the same kind. Now surely a Minister of the Gospel may as well inform us as to things necessary which are sufficiently plain, as a Generall Councill in things of Controversie, which are not necessary to be believed on either part. For suppose the *judgement* of the Church were not divided from the word of God, but we take the word from the Church, as *Stapleton* says in his Epistle dedi-

dedicatory of his Doctrinall principles (and yet herein he ſeems to beg the queſtion, whether the Scripture was intended onely to bear that ſenſe which the Church gives of it) yet as to things ſufficiently plain, there is no need of conſulting the judgement of the Church; becauſe they are ſuch, then, as they will ſay, that the definitions of a Councill are ſo plain, that any Prieſt of theirs may inſtruct the people in the right ſenſe: ſo the Scriptures are ſo plainly delivered as to things neceſſary, that any Miniſter of the Goſpell may make a man wiſe unto ſalvation by them. And we may well ſay that the Scriptures were inſpired for this purpoſe.

And therefore have I yielded him what he deſired; yet it being ſo ingenuous, I ſhall alſo rehearſe it, *Do but allow me this to the Church, that it can competently through the Scripture direct the people to their happineſſe, and we will not contend with you, whether this competent direction ſhall be called an infallible direction or not.*

*Anſ.* I could be content to ſtand to ſuch an iſſue, and to compromiſe the diſpute unto ſuch terms. For we can freely allow unto him all this, even *pendente lite*. And we have formerly allowed as much: therefore have they either no mind to accept of our reſpect to the Church; or my Adverſary of his own accord is coming to move moderation, that which he ſays here hath three importments: firſt, an authority and faculty of the Church; which we have granted. Secondly, that this authority, in the exerciſe of its faculty is directive through the Scriptures. Thirdly, that this direction to the people is competent to their happineſs. Only let it be provided, that the Church its direction of the people by the Scriptures doth not

derogate from the peoples uſe of the Scripture; thus we can afford all this: for this is no way contradictory to our propoſition, that the Scripture doth contain plainly all things neceſſary to ſalvation: or not this alſo, that a Miniſter of the Goſpell may competently inform the people in the neceſſaries to ſalvation. And if a Miniſter can do it, ſurely the Church. But the ſtreſſe of the diſcourſe lies in this, whether what the Church can doe may not ſufficiently be done without the Church: And then ſecondly, if not without the Church, whether it may not be done without the Church its infallibility. Now to this laſt my Adverſary ſpeaks thus, that he ſtands not upon this, whether *this competent direction ſhould be called an infallible direction or not.* No? doth he not? Then he ſeemeth to yield that which he hath ſo much contended for, the infallibilitie of the Church; that that is not neceſſary. He hath formerly urged the infallibility of the Church to ground faith; now he either grants, that we may be ſaved without faith; or, that faith may be grounded without infallibility: which indeed in my opinion doth yield the cauſe. But then alſo they will give us leave to note that the cauſe betwixt the Romaniſt and us, as to *verbum non Scriptum*, is alſo yielded hereby: for if he will ſit down with this poſtulate, that the Church may competently direct us to happineſſe *through the Scriptures*, then the word not written is ſecluded from a competent direction to ſalvation. For the word not written is abſolutely contradiſtinguiſhed to *Scriptures*. And therefore I ſee no reaſon we ſhould goe further in this work, which is not ſo hard, as tedious.

But

But that he calls us back with an *Epanorthoſis*, *Though we think it moſt certain that no fallible direction can competently direct the people to happineſſe.* Well, will they ſtand to this? Where ſhall we have them? If it can, then as before. If it cannot upon their ſecond thoughts; then we ſay, *abſolute loquendo*, we grant it; thus, that the Church not propoſing any infallible direction cannot competently direct us; and therefore untill they prove the Church infallible in their traditions infallible too: or as to the interpreting of Scripture, they have no cauſe by their own argument to obtrude ſo often the authority of the Church; becauſe it is no competent direction to happineſs, unleſſe it be infallible, as they now think. But take the Church as propoſing Scripture, which we have hitherto made plain ſufficiently as to things neceſſary; ſo, though the Church be not infallible in its own direction; yet being conſidered, as bringing Scripture which is infallible, it may competently direct unto happineſſe. And ſo theſe great magnifiers of the Church, upon due account, have left us in the field to defend the Church when they have left it. We can make uſe of its competent direction, with the Scripture, which is certain and infallible. They cannot make uſe of the Church without infallibility. So then, as the Catholick Moderator ſays of the reformed religion, that it cannot be blamed in the point of juſtification, ſince it lays hold upon that which can certainly ſave us, namely, the righteouſneſſe of Chriſt: ſo alſo to be ſure, here we are on the ſurer hand, becauſe we make uſe of that which is certainly infallible, the Scripture; and alſo of that which gives us ſome competent direction, the Church; ſpecially taking the Church univerſally for place and time. It is no

queſtion

question that the present Church cannot end the present controversies.

*Now because, by the way, I did say our Church could not err in damnative errors, you conceive me to grant that it may err in points not damnative.*

*Ans.* This is well put in [*by the way I did say*] he spake it more than once; and it appeared also to be spoken provisionally, that there might be some refuge for the Church, if it should be convicted of some error; yet not *damnative*. And surely it were better for them to lie close under the buckler of this distinction unless they had better arguments to prove universall infallibility. But since, it may be, Mr. *Knot's* inconveniences of that distinction have been found prevalent, and so it is quitted.

He expounds himself thus, *When I said these words I did onely take and subsume that which you your selves most commonly grant unto the Church, that it cannot err in damnative matters.*

*Ans.* This but one degree from a *Knowhere*. He says he meant it as we. If he meant it as we, how doth he conclude against us? We hold it distinctively, upon the case of the whole Catholick Church; though a particular Church may err in points damnative. So then he, meaning it as we, leaves the way plain to infer that he held that the Church might err in points not *damnative*. If he *did take* it as we, we are agreed: and then by Mr. *Knot's* argument infallibility is extinguished. He used it formerly in way of distinction, and specificatively or not. If not, then the use of it formerly is none: if so, then he is lost. And they may very easily perswade themselves that we can allow unto them this priviledge of the Church,

that

that *it hath a main advantage over any Minister, or private Interpreter.* This we can afford unto them without absolute infallibility of the Church. If they will be contented with such a priviledge to the Church as no Minister or private Interpreter can have, they need not exceed the distinction of the Church's not erring in damnatives, specifically taken. For a private Minister or Interpreter may erre in damnatives. Yea, also this exemption from errors damnative (in this sense) gives a demonstrative *reason why we should not follow our own interpretations*, without apparent cause, because the Church (universall) cannot err in damnatives, therefore we should prefer that, when we see not plain cause to the contrary: and because it may err in other things, therefore cannot we absolutely yield the Church obedience of faith for its own sake. And our differences from the Church in interpretations are not therefore *damnative* simply because we differ from the Church, but if we contemn the Church which hath authority and more faculty, and if we wrest hard texts, as some men did in *St. Paul's Epistles to their own perdition, as St. Peter saith.* Interpretations may be *flatly contrary* and not *damnative.* till the Church be proved without possibility of error, to be without possibility of error: let them then hold the former distinction until they can make good these two points: first, that the Church cannot err at all: the second, that all error is damnative. These are two hard propositions; and therefore, if that which is most hard is most easily broken, as the rule is in the Trent History, they should do well to break them. When the Church shall shew her *Commission for her infallibility*, she may shew her Commission for our obedience intuitive.

Here

Num. 9. Here he begins, *I will presse again your text and give a second answer.* Namely, the second Ep. to *Tim.* 3, 16. So then now we shall contend πρὸς ἐλεγξ. He says we render the word *for correction*; *so your Bible reads it.* And why doth he note this? Because it is right? Will he correct the Magnificate? This is *adverbum* to the Text πρὸς ἐπανόρθωσιν; Yea, he cannot find fault with our translation in this without condemnation of the Rhemish: for so they, *to correct.*

From hence he says, *You should conclude thus, All Scripture is given by inspiration of God. But all Doctrine given by inspiration from God containeth plainly all things necessary to salvation; Therefore all Scripture containeth plainly all things necessary to salvation.*

*Ans.* I am easily brought to St. *Basil's* rule, διδάσκειν ἀνεπιφθόνως, μανθάνειν ἀνεπαισχύντως, to teach without envy, to learn without shame. But I need not learn from my Adversary how to order my discourse in this particular. The forenamed text, which I used in my second rejoinder, was produced partly against his assertion, that, *If God had not left us the infallible direction of his Church, he had not well provided for the salvation of men.* To this I opposed the text in the 15, and 16. v. that *the Scriptures are able to make us wise unto salvation*: And by consequent, God hath well provided for salvation of men in generall. Then I urged the particulars, in which it is able to make us wise unto salvation, in the 16. ver. And now, because I did not conclude punctually against the terms he hath in this paper, (and yet, *nemo temetur divinare*) he tells me, that I and ours *have a notable talent in not concluding contradictorily.* As he said in *Tacitus*, *Utinam tu tam fortiter feries.*

*ries*. To the buſineſſe then, we ſay, firſt, that my Adverſary did, or might know, that in a diſcourſe every Syllogiſm, or proof, or anſwer, doth not formally, and *in terminis* conclude againſt the main queſtion. It is ſufficient if it concludes againſt the laſt inſtance: for if that be rightly made, the virtue thereof will rebound ultimately to the principal queſtion. And ſecondly, as to his Syllogiſm, which he thinks concludes abſurdly upon our opinion, we ſay it is unanſwerable, becauſe it hath neither mode nor figure. He had better have put it into an *Enthymem*; or a full Syllogiſm thus: Whatſoever is inſpired by God contains plainly all things neceſſary to ſalvation. All Scripture is inſpired by God, therefore all Scripture. Now he had the wit not to put it thus, becauſe we ſhould, ſo, eaſily have denied the *major*, as it is to be taken in the note of univerſality, [*whatſoever*] diſtributively; yea, alſo and becauſe whatſoever ſo is inſpired doth not contain any thing neceſſary to ſalvation: for every thing in Scripture doth not contain any neceſſary point. And therefore like a Sophiſter he wraps it up in an obſcure form; yea, none, that it might not be diſcovered. Thirdly, if *All* in the propoſitions be taken collectively or complexively, ſo we own the matter of the propoſitions, and the Concluſion hath nothing in it but ſound Doctrine without his conſequences of *teaching ſubmiſſion and obedience to the Church, and by her all things neceſſary to ſalvation*. And fourthly, he ſhould diſcreetly have taken *all Scripture* complexively: for if it were to be underſtood diſtributively, then, if every part of Scripture were profitable to all thoſe ends, what would become of their additions of *verbum non ſcriptum*? If every part could

make the man of God perfect, what uſe of the merchandize of traditions, as of neceſſity to ſalvation? And yet fifthly, it is like he would have ſwallowed his own diſcourſe for the Church thus, All definitions of the Church are inſpired by God. All Doctrine of the Church inſpired by God contains all things neceſſary to ſalvation; therefore all definitions of the Church contain all things neceſſary to ſalvation. This would have pleaſed him well, ſince he ſays the Scripture teacheth all things neceſſary to ſalvation, *eo ipſo*, by this one article, becauſe it *teacheth us ſubmiſſion to the Church and by her all things neceſſary to ſalvation*. Therefore ſixthly, he miſtakes me ſimply, or worſe, if he thought that I meant to conclude contradictorily by every particular unto which the Scripture is profitable. He commits herein a fallacie of diviſion, making that to be concluded ſeverally which is to be concluded jointly. And ſeventhly, we will now join iſſue with our Adverſary upon the text, and firſt, upon the 15. ver. thus, That which is able to make us wiſe unto ſalvation contains plainly all things neceſſary to ſalvation: but the holy Scriptures are able to make us wiſe unto ſalvation. Therefore the Scripture contains plainly all things neceſſary to ſalvation. And if there be exceptions made as to the *major*, that *Timothy* was not an ordinary man, and therefore though they might have that effect upon *Timothy*, yet not upon every one; we ſay as before, that it follows *ex abundanti*. If there were enough to make him wiſe, then *a majori*, others; becauſe he, as a Miniſter, needed more direction, as my adverſary affirm'd with Mr. *Croſſy*. And I hope they will not ſay, that they were able to make him wiſe unto ſalvation, becauſe *he had learned them from his youth*;

for

for then if they would learn them from their youth they might make them alſo wiſe unto ſalvation: and therefore they ſhould alſo learn them from their youth, as the ſaying of the Jews was, a boy of five yeares old is to be applyed to the Bible. Again, *a fortiori*, if the old Teſtament was able to make him wiſe unto ſalvation, then ſurely the old and the new together: but the old was able to make him wiſe unto ſalvation; the new not being yet for *a great part* written, as the Rhemiſts note. And when they can find as much reaſon for the addition of their word not-written to the new Teſtament, as there was for the addition of the new Teſtament to the old, then let them ſay that this text doth not exclude Traditions. If they did ſay, it did not exclude Traditive interpretations, it would be more reaſonable; becauſe the new is added to illuſtrate and declare the old: but it excludes traditions of new matter; becauſe the new adds no new matter to the old. And yet again, as to the manner of delivery of things neceſſary in Scripture; if the old Teſtament, which was more obſcure, was yet able to make *Timothy* wiſe (as to point of knowledge) unto ſalvation: then certainly in the new Teſtament is there ſufficiencie of plainneſſe, becauſe the new is the old revealed, as St. *Paul* ſpeaks, 2. Ep. to the *Cor.* 3. 18. *But we all with open face beholding as in a glaſſe, the glory of the Lord, are changed into the ſame Image from glory to glory as by the Spirit of the Lord.*

And now we will put into the argument all the ends unto which the Scripture is profitable. That which is profitable to all thoſe ends ſpoken of in the 16. ver. *to Doctrine*, in things to be known;

*to redargution* of errors; *to correction* of manners; *to inſtruction, in Righteouſnes, that the man of God might be perfect, furniſhed for every good work*, doth ſufficiently provide all unto ſalvation, becauſe *Timothy*, as before; and alſo with ſufficient plainneſſe, ſince the old Teſtament could do it before the new was conſigned: but the Scripture taken *in complexo* doth ſo. Therefore this text is ſufficiently full and clear againſt them.

And his argument out of this text againſt me, wherein he ſays he hath *a contradictory concluſion againſt me*, we will now hear: this it is. *That which in this text is ſaid onely to be profitable for theſe ends, is not thereby ſaid to be ſufficient to theſe ends; and yet much leſſe ſufficient to end all Controverſies neceſſary to ſalvation by it ſelf alone: but the Scripture in this text is ſaid onely to be profitable to theſe ends here expreſſed: Ergo.*

*Anſ.* The Anſwer unto this of his may maintains the *major* of my laſt Syllogiſm. For thus *Eſtius* and my Adverſary diſtinguiſh upon the *major*, that the Scripture may be profitable, and not neceſſary for theſe ends; and ſo in effect, the Rhemiſts upon the text, *that the reading of the Holy Scripture is a great defence and help of the faithfull, eſpecially of a Biſhop.* And this is the ground of his Argument. We anſwer therefore, firſt; if he means his *major* thus, that what is not ſaid in terms to be ſo, is not ſaid ſo by conſequence neither, his *minor* is not true. And if he mean it otherwiſe, it is peccant in the ignorance of the *Elench*; for we can acknowledge his Concluſion without prejudice to our cauſe: for though it be not ſaid ſo in terms, yet by equi-

valence

valence, and *interpretative* it is. Secondly, to the *minor* we say, though it be only said to be profitable: yet since it is not said that it is onely profitable, it doth not exclude sufficiency: that which affirms so much simply doth not simply deny more: for then we could no way reconcile divers historicall passages of the Evangelists. But that it doth include sufficiency, *Bellarmin* and my Adversary do deny; *Bellarmin* to *Chemnitius*; my Adversary to me. (Yet *Bellarmin* stands not so much against the term, as if it could not be understood *sufficient*; but contends that the Scripture is not sufficient alone: *as meat, though it be profitable to nutrition, yet it is not sufficient alone. For if naturall heat be wanting or any other Instrument of the body necessary to nutrition, it will not nourish, in his fourth B. de verbo Dei non scripto, cap.* 10. But what is this to the purpose? For we doe not maintain the Scripture to be sufficient to salvation, alone; for there must be faith and repentance and obedience. And therefore St. *Paul* adds upon the place, *through faith that is in Christ Jesus*; but we say it is sufficient *in suo genere*, as to direction of us: this satisfies our cause. If this be confessed, we have done. As meat is sufficient as to the matter which should nourish: so the word of God is sufficient, as to the matter of things necessary to be known; yea, for our comfort too, as *Isid. Clarius* upon the text: and therefore he says when St. *Paul* had used many consolations, he useth here the greatest. *For surely it is the most strong consolation to have the Scripture sent from Heaven, quæ et tantis in tenebris lumen præferat, et gravissima quæque efficiat ut fiant levia. And these comforts (he says) he did seasonably give him when he was to tell him of the sad*

*news*

*news of his departure.* And as for the word there, ἐφίλησε, if we would take aim of the ſenſe by the Syriack (ſince the Greek intimates the Hebrew in the new Teſtament, and the Syriack is called the Hebrew in the new Teſtament) it ſeems to be ſo profitable as is ſufficient; becauſe the word for [profitable] in the Syriack is taken from a word which ſignifies to abound and exceed. Thirdly, although all that is profitable is not ſufficient (though all that is ſufficient is profitable) yet that which is profitable *ut ſic*, as to perfection, ſeems very ſufficient. That which helps him to perfection helps him ſufficiently: *quoad hoc*, as to point of knowledge. And if it extends not to ſufficencie in the expreſſion: the reaſon may be, becauſe other things alſo are profitable practically. And therefore is *ſufficient to end all Controverſies neceſſary to ſalvation by it ſelf alone.* Becauſe there need not be any controverſies neceſſary to ſalvation: yea, rather neceſſary it is that there ſhould be no Controverſies about things neceſſary to ſalvation: becauſe poſſibility of error in thoſe things is ſo dangerous. And therefore he ſuppoſeth that which is not to be ſuppoſed. *For the man of God may be perfect by Scripture; ready furniſhed to every good work.* The man of God; to wit, the Miniſter. So St. *Paul* of *Timothy* according to proportion to the Jewiſh Title, *but thou man of God flie theſe things.* And this we ſtrengthen with St. *Cryſoſtom's* note upon the text, οὐχ' ἁπλῶς μετέχων, ἀλλὰ μετὰ ἀκριβείας ἐξηρτισμένος· not ſimply partaking, but with accurateneſſe furniſhed: and again before, Ἀντ' ἐμοῦ γοῦν ἔχεις· εἰ τι θέλεις μαθεῖν, ἐκεῖθεν ἄντλησον· Inſtead of me thou haſt the Scriptures (not traditions) if you will learn any thing from thence you may, ſo that the Fathers comment imports the Scripture

Scripture to be ſufficient, as to learning. If any thing elſe could be pretended as equally profitable, then either St. *Paul's* teaching him: but he was to depart; and in ſtead of him he was to have the Scriptures; or traditions: but he ſaith not, thou haſt the word not written; but thou haſt the Scriptures; and that the man of God by the Scripture may be with accurateneſſe furniſhed. Therefore untill they can find any thing ſufficient without Scripture, or any thing neceſſarily conducing to the ſufficiency of Scripture, we reſt contented with our cauſe upon account of this text; wherein alſo, as uſually, by a *Synecdoche*, leſſe is ſaid: more is underſtood. If the Pontificians had ſuch a text for their cauſe; this *profitable* text would have been made ſufficient.

As for the third anſwer, that *St. Paul doth not ſo much as ſpeak of the whole Canon of Scripture; whence he is moſt weakly cited to prove that the whole Canon containeth clearly all things neceſſary to ſalvation*; We may not ſay that this is *weakly* urged. For the argument proceeds *a fortiori*, as before. If part of the Canon; if the old Teſtament be ſufficient, then the whole much more. And if Traditions were neceſſary to be added to the old Teſtament, as happily they will ſay, why did God give us the new Teſtament? And to be even with them again; when they ſpeak of the Roman Church, we might alſo ſay, this is *weakly* urged, to prove the opinion of the whole Church; becauſe they do not *ſpeak of the whole* Church.

*Again, when this is proved, it is manifeſt that part of the whole Canon is loſt. How then know you the ſame neceſſary points not delivered in other parts of Scripture were not delivered in theſe parts of*

*Scrip-*

*Scripture which are perished, and so are come not to be extant in writing?*

*Anſ.* The former is, I ſuppoſe *proved* more than they deſire. And to this we anſwer, firſt, if it be manifeſt that ſome part of Scripture is periſhed, he might have told us, which; otherwiſe it ſeems it is not manifeſt. No certain and manifeſt knowledge of the generall but by ſome particulars. Secondly, If any part be loſt, it is either of the old, or of the new Teſtament: if of the old, the new hath the ſame matter, as to ſufficiency, with clearneſſe. If of the new; the old was able to make *Timothy* wiſe unto ſalvation. And my Adverſary might have known, that not onely Mr. *Chillingworth* affirms that there is enough in one Goſpel preciſely neceſſary to ſalvation: but alſo that their *Bellarmin* in the former *B.* and *Ch.* ſays that all the utilities of Scripture which here are rehearſed, are found in the ſecond Ep. of St. *John*. If any book then be loſt, (which we are not certain of, nor they neither, becauſe, for ought we know, not defined by the Church) yet by his opinion (namely, *Bellarmins*) that which remains may be profitable, (yea, ſufficient) for thoſe uſes without an infallible Judge. And again, if any book of either Teſtament or any of both be loſt, this will redound to the prejudice of the Roman; becauſe they account that they onely are the Church, and that the Church is the keeper of Divine truth; then they have not faithfully preſerved the truth of God; and therefore, if they were infallible in what they doe propoſe how ſhould we truſt them, that what is delivered as truth, they would keep; ſince through their negligence they have let ſome book or books of Scripture periſh? *Quis cuſto-*

*custodiet ipsos custodes?* But it may be they have kept traditions more faithfully. Then surely the books of Scripture were lost with good discretion, that it might reflect honor to the integrity of Traditions.

*O sanctas Gentes quibus hæc nascuntur in hortis Numina!*

*Your second Text to prove this is Heb.* 4. 12. Num. 10. *Here is the text; but where is the contradictory conclusion* in terminis, *and that evidently? that it is plainly set down in Scripture that the Scripture by it self alone is sufficient to decide all necessary Controversies, &c.*

*Ans. Omne reducitur ad principium*, as *Aquinas's* rule is. The occasion of this began thus. I was to dispute against the Judges authority to bind upon his own account; as he might have noted, had he pleased. My argument was this, the Judge determins by Scripture or not. If not, then he makes a new law; and the authority of the Church in proposing Divine truths is immediate by the assistance of the Holy Ghost, and not by disquisition; (which *Stapleton* denies in the beginning of his sixth generall Controversie) if by Scripture, then doth his determination bind by authority of Scripture, whereof he is but a Minister. This my Adversary says not a word unto. Then *ex abundanti*; I put this text to him to give him a check in the course of his exceptions against Scripture. We do not say that the Scripture is formally a Judge: but yet by this text we have so much said as amounts in effect, to be a Judge internall by mediation of conscience; which is more than their Judge infallible can pretend to.

And therefore as to the demand of a Contradictory Concluſion from hence, I ſay, this text was pertinently produced to that purpoſe I intended of it; which was not that it ſhould be a directory weapon againſt my Adverſary, but that it ſhould be of uſe to cut off their Pleas againſt Scripture, as that it is a dead letter, not a living Judge; it is *living, quick*: that it can do nothing; it *is active in it ſelf*, that it cannot decide controverſies; *it is ſharper than any two edged ſword*. As the law decides caſes of right, ſo it decides Controverſies of faith. And thoſe points of faith (pretended) which are not contained therein, it doth cut off. If they ſay, it cannot reach the Conſcience: What then can? *It is piercing to the dividing aſunder ſoul and ſpirit, joints and marrow*. If they ſay it cannot judge, it is here *κριτικὸς*, critical, exactly judicative of the thoughts and notions of the heart.

But, to come to the point, he would have me ſhew that this *ſharpneſſe is in order not onely to decide Controverſies, but alſo all neceſſary Controverſies, and to do this by it ſelf alone*. And if not, *where is then your Contradictory Concluſion?*

*Anſ.* It may decide Controverſies, and not neceſſary Controverſies; but if it decide neceſſary Controverſies, then, to be ſure, it doth decide Controverſies. Our queſtion is whether it determins neceſſary Controverſies. Yes, neither are we bound to diſpute the queſtion, becauſe we ſaid it not, nor are we bound to make it good in their ſenſe. In our ſenſe yet it doth ſufficiently decide all neceſſary Controverſies; becauſe it doth ſo plainly deliver things of neceſſary faith, that there needs not be any deciſion of them by any inerrable Judge. And then alſo ſecondly, becauſe, if there be any queſtion about neceſſary points, the Scripture

is the rule according to which it is to be determined. And thirdly, it doth in effect examine and judge in the inward man cases of opinion and of action, which an externall Judge doth not, as ſuch: becauſe they are not known to him. And in this regard, I conceive, that the heretick is ſaid as before, to be αὐτοκατάκριτος: becauſe the law of God, or of the Spirit of God in the law, doth by his own Conſcience condemn him in holding a materiall error againſt his own light. Yea, let them anſwer to their own *Eſtius*, who upon the place ſaith, that the Scripture hath the properties of God attributed to it; and becauſe God ſpeaks to us by Scripture: and therefore he ſaith, *Ut Gladius penetrat et ledit: ità ſermo Dei intuetur et punit: Itaque ſignificatur cognitio non nuda ſed qualis eſt Judicis examinantis et cognoſcentis ut puniat.* As the ſword pierceth and woundeth: ſo doth the word of God take notice and puniſh; therefore is ſignified not a naked knowledge, but ſuch as is of a Judge, examining and taking cognizance, that it may puniſh. Now becauſe that which is not intended ſometimes proves better than that which was intended (as the rule is, *Melius eſt aliquando id quod eſt per accidens quam id quod eſt per ſe*) therefore may we draw an argument in form from hence, thus; That which judgeth, and infallibly, is an infallible Judge. The Scripture judgeth; ſo the text: and *Eſtius* upon it: and infallibly; as they will confeſſe; then the Scripture is an infallible Judge. Now if it be an infallible Judge, it is very reaſonable that it ſhould be an infallible Judge as to points neceſſary: and then ἐν τῷ ἀναγκαίῳ, there is no neceſſity of an externall infallible Judge as to determine faith; for that is done by it: there

may be need of a Judge externall, as to peace; but for this there is no need of a Judge infallible. If any thing would content them but a ſpirituall Monarchy, this might: yea, neither, it may be, if ſuch a Monarchy were neceſſary, were this infallibility neceſſary; becauſe Miniſteriall authority doth not eſſentially include ſuch an infallibility.

But he goes on, and uſeth an argument againſt me. *The word of God according to your own Doctrine was not ſufficient to decide all neceſſary Controverſies before the whole Canon of Scripture was compleatly finiſhed: but St.* Paul *ſaid this of the word of God before the Canon of the Scripture was compleatly finiſhed. Therefore St.* Paul *ſaid this of the word of God before the word of God was of it ſelf alone ſufficient to decide all Controverſies. Therefore then it had been falſe to ſay the word of God had been ſufficient to this end. Therefore St.* Paul *did not then ſay ſo.*

*Anſ.* Beſides what I ſaid before concerning the uſe which I made of this text; and to ſay nothing of what is here ſuppoſed, that St. *Paul* was the Author of this Epiſtle to the Hebrews; I anſwer to the *major*, that that part of Scripture was then ſufficient, before the whole Canon was compleatly finiſhed, in our ſenſe to decide all neceſſary Controverſies as well as the old Teſtament was ſufficient to make *Timothy* wiſe unto ſalvation. and for thoſe uſes which are there ſpoken of in that text to *Timothy*: therefore he miſtakes us if he thinks we hold that that part which was then written, was not ſufficient. And yet more might be added by God though not by man; for the Canon then did not reſtrain God but man. Therefore we anſwer alſo to the aſſumption, that if he takes

takes *compleatly finiſhed*, ſimply; then indeed St. *Paul* ſaid it before the Canon was compleatly finiſhed; but if he takes the words ſo as that part which was written was not ſufficient in our ſenſe, we deny it. For then God had not ſufficiently provided for the Church of thoſe times; neither had the Scripture been able to make *Timothy* wiſe unto ſalvation. So the terms in the former ſenſe do not conclude: in the latter they are concluding, but not true. So this ſpecious argument is at an end without its end. Onely, we will now make uſe of the argument againſt him, turning the mouth of the Canon, as we may ſpeak, and it is thus; St. *Paul* ſaid this of the Scripture before the Canon was compleatly finiſhed; therefore now much rather after it is thus compleatly finiſhed, is it ſufficient. Or more fully thus, The word of God according to his Doctrine is not ſufficient after the Canon is compleatly finiſhed: St. *Paul* ſaid this of the word of God before the Canon was compleatly finiſhed: therefore his Doctrine is contradictory to St. *Pauls*, *ex abundanti*, for St. *Paul* ſays the word was ſufficient before the Canon was compleated: and he ſays it is not ſufficient after it is compleated.

*Again thoſe words ſpeak not of the word of God blunted with thoſe interpretations which your opinion licenſeth.*

*Anſ.* This is a plain cavill, or a ſlander: we licenſe not any blunting of the edge of Scripture by any miſ-interpretations. We do not deny the uſe of Scripture, as the Romaniſts do to the people. Neither is it fit for them to complain of blunting the edge, who take away the Sword of the Spirit. We onely allow the people to be perſwaded in their own mind concerning the ſenſe of Scrip-

Scripture: and if the Pontifician authority or arguments be able, *ex officio*, to perſwade them, that what ſenſe they give is authentick, let them be perſwaded. But it is very uſuall for them to quarrell firſt who are moſt guilty, that ſo they may leaſt be diſcovered. But who blunt Scripture ſo much as they who ſay the Scripture is like a hole of wax, which may be turned any way? Let him that is without ſin in this kind caſt the firſt ſtone at us. How they have adulterated Scripture is known to all the world.

*But of the word of God applied according to the Divinely-ſpirited interpretation of the Church, in whoſe hands, hands guided by the Holy Ghoſt, this word of God is managed for the deciſion of Controverſies, that it is ſharper than any two edged Sword.*

*Anſ.* How often muſt we be forced to tell them that we exclude not the uſe of the Church in a due Repreſentative towards compoſing of differences: and alſo that the Church is not now infallibly guided by the Holy Ghoſt. And therefore that their deciſion is not the laſt reſolutive of faith: and that there is no need of any ſuch infallible Judge for neceſſary Controverſies, ſince there is no neceſſity of Controverſies about things neceſſary. And alſo that, if there were ſuch a Judge infallible, we muſt know it, and who it is, infallibly. And alſo then hereby are excluded the ἀπρίτους of traditions: for if the Scripture interpreted by the Church be to decide all Controverſies, then what need to have recourſe to the word not written, as to that which equally binds in things of faith? And ſo then they deſtroy themſelves. And therefore whereas they ſay frequently that Scripture alone doth not decide all neceſſary Contro-

troverſies, we can eaſily diſtinguiſh, that *alone* hath reſpect either to the Church or to traditions; as it oppoſeth traditions, ſo *alone*; and it doth exclude them: and as it doth reſpect the Church, ſo, though it doth not exclude the uſe of a Judge, yet it doth exclude the neceſſity of a Judge infallible.

His other lines unto the eleventh num. might have been ſpared, *ſi non earum prius nec poſterius*. And they have alſo been anſwered.

And here wiſely he joins to the examination of my former texts, another text which I produce againſt him in anſwer to the fourteenth number, that he might handſomely decline an anſwer to that, which, if he would have dealt punctually, I ſhould have been anſwered in its place, but we follow him at the running leap. The text is that of Chriſt, Search the Scriptures, St. *John* 5. 39. Num. 11.

His exception is this, To prove this to be underſtood in the Imperative mood *evidently is impoſſible*, therefore, *evidently they do not maintain a Command*. This is the ſum of that diſcourſe.

*Anſ.* Firſt, evident proof they had not beſt urge: for then what will become of all their faith and all their diſcourſe, which doth not amount to ſo much as probability? Secondly, if it be more probable to be underſtood in the Imperative, it is ſufficient to weaken their cauſe; ſince I am to be conſidered, as propoſing the text by way of a reſpondent, not as an opponent. Therefore if I name a text which is but probable againſt them, it is enough for me againſt them, ſpecially in the cauſe of infallibility; for a probable contradiction undoes infallibility. Thirdly, it is in the Syriack in the Imperative mood: and this interpretation,

if

if any other ſhould weigh with us. Yea, alſo, ſo do the Rhemiſh Tranſlators read it, in the Imperative. Are they alſo decived? then how ſhall we be aſcertained of the ſenſe of Scripture by Rhemiſh Interpreters? So *Perus* alſo upon the place expounds it to be a direction to the Jews of ſearching the Scriptures out of a greedineſſe to know the truth. And again, upon the latter words, *They are they which bear witneſſe of me*, he ſays, that Chriſt cites no place, but ſpeaks in generall, *tam ut ad quærendum incitet*, both that he might incite them to ſeek. And ſo alſo *Stapleton* reads it in his *Principia Doctrinalia*, in the Imperative. And alſo beſides, not ſo often do we find a verb of the Indicative mood to begin a ſentence. But then alſo fourthly, the reaſon concludes it a duty: and the duty concludes a command. It concludes a duty thus, that which bears witneſſe of Chriſt, being in doubt we are bound to ſearch: and they bear witneſſe of Chriſt, and were then in doubt; therefore for that our Saviour ſhould not affirm it but upon their opinion (in that he ſaith *for in them ye think to have eternall life*) is no materiall ſcruple, becauſe the verb δοκῶ as in other Authors, ſo in Scripture is uſed by way of elegancie: and then our Saviour ſays himſelf that they bear witneſſe of him, and therefore we have in them eternall life Doctrinally. And ſo St. *Auſtin* in his 45. *ſerm. de verbis Domini*, ſays, as expounding the place, *queritis me et non invenietis: quare? quia non ſcrutamini Scripturas quæ teſtimonium perhibent de me*, yee ſeek me but ſhall not find me: why? becauſe you do not ſearch the Scriptures, which bear witneſſe of me. Therefore may we conclude (καὶ ἀναγκαίως ἄλλως) that it is to be taken in the Imperative.

And

And therefore his exception, that it follows not, *becauſe they teſtifie clearly this one point whereof he ſpake, therefore the Scriptures teſtifie cleerly all that is neceſſary to be believed in any point of Controverſie neceſſary to ſalvation*, that exception falls down before my argument, as *Dagon* before the Ark; becauſe it is not only grounded upon this, that the Scriptures bear witneſſe of him, but alſo in that [*you think to have in them eternall life.*] And this propoſition, if there were need, we might proye by what was ſaid before, that which is able to make us wiſe unto ſalvation hath in it eternall life: the Scriptures (of the old Teſtament) were able to make wiſe unto ſalvation, therefore, they have in them eternall life; and by conſequent, they contain all things neceſſary to ſalvation. And therefore though this excluded not *the hearing of John or Chriſts Miracles*, as he would inferr, as upon duty; yet it excludes them as upon ſimple neceſſity to ſalvation. Otherwiſe thoſe who dyed before Chriſt and *John* could not have been ſaved. The force of his ratiocination comes to as much as this, as if becauſe one had a great eſtate, he could not live of leſſe; or as if, becauſe he can live of leſſe he ought not to follow his calling, whereby he may get more. This is not the queſtion, whether we ought to hear whatſoever God ſays: for this we affirm; but this is the queſtion, whether it be ſaid becauſe it is neceſſary, or neceſſary to be heard becauſe it was ſaid: the former we deny. The neceſſity was not antecedent to the diction: but hearing hath it ſelf to the diction, as a neceſſary conſequent. So this text is yet good againſt him.

Onely he urgeth me with St. *Cyrill's* opinion of the mood, and alſo *Beza's*. I had thought he

would have made no mention any more of any Father of the Church, because he says, I do not allow infallibility to their testimony. It seems their authority must yet be good against us, though not for us.

To *Beza's* judgement we will oppose, *quoad hominem*, the interpretation of the Rhemists and *Ferus*, as before. To St. *Cyrill's* authority we say, we can confront it with St. *Chrysostom's*: and yet we do not build upon the mood; for the reason binds us. Yet because he seems to have his mind turned in better affection to the Fathers, it will be reasonable to set down St. *Crysostom's* words hereupon: διὰτὶ τῶν γεγραμμένων, he sends them to the Scriptures. Add again also, Καὶ ἡμεῖς τοίνυν ὅταν πρὸς αἱρετικοὺς πολεμῶμεν καὶ καινοτομῶμεθα, ἐντεῦθεν ἰσχυριζόμεθα; And we therefore, when we are to fight with Hereticks and are armed against them, are strengthned from hence, namely, from the Scriptures; for so it follows in him as a reason, *for all Scripture is given by inspiration, &c.*

Num. 12. *Your fourth text is, You err not knowing the Scriptures.* And from hence he demands *a Contradictory Conclusion: shall it be this? Therefore all things necessary to salvation are plainly set down in Scripture? Or rather this, Therefore all things necessary to salvation are not plainly set down in Scripture? For this is the far stronger consequence.*

*Ans.* Indeed he seemed to love rather to baffle his Adversary than to answer him. For here again he dislocates my answer, that where it was proper it might not be answered, and where it is not formally contradictory, it may not seem opposite. Doth this become men that would lead us the right way by truth to happiness?

The

The citation of this text comes in to give him ſatisfaction unto his argument, that *if Chriſt had intended this book for our ſole Judge in all Controverſies, he would undoubtedly in ſome part of this book have told us ſo clearly; this importing ſo exceedingly, as it doth, and yet he hath not done ſo.* To this I ſaid, we anſwer, Chriſt hath directly declared his will to oblige us unto Scripture in that he bindeth us to *ſearch the Scriptures*; in that he ſaith, *ye err not knowing the Scriptures*; and alſo adding the other text to *Timothy*: All Scripture is given by inſpiration; and alſo 2. Ep. *Pet.* 1. 19. *We have a more ſure word of Prophecy*: thus I ſaid: and alſo allowed him the uſe of externall Judges without neceſſity of infallibility; and alſo I retorted his argument, If Chriſt had intended the Church ſhould have been the infallible Judge, it importing ſo exceedingly, he would have told us ſo clearly, which he hath not done, &c. Now if all my texts be able to give a full account of our being obliged to Scripture in point of faith, and not to an infallible Judge externall, it is enough for me, and my purpoſe, to which I uſed them: but he cunningly draws that text from the proper uſe, and ſhews it here not to be fit for a contradiction to that which formally is another queſtion than that to which it was applyed, but let theſe tricks go.

I will now take the texts together, and from thence conclude contradictorily to the preſent queſtion, *Whether all things neceſſary to ſalvation be plainly ſet down in Scripture*, thus:

If we be referred to Scripture in point of faith and not to an infallible Judge, then the Scripture doth plainly ſet down things neceſſary to ſalvation. But we are referred to Scripture (as

appears by thoſe texts) and not to an infallible Judge, (for ought appears clear by my Adverſary) therefore the Scripture plainly ſets down all things neceſſary to ſalvation, the conſequence is plain as denying the reaſon of an infallible Judge; which ſhould be, becauſe we are not ſufficiently furniſhed in Scripture unto things of faith: then if we be referred to Scripture in point of faith: as there is no need of tradition to ſupply our faith in the matter; ſo neither is there an infallible Judge neceſſary, to ſupply the want of the Scriptures manner of expreſſion. For all the Controverſie betwixt us, in point of Scripture, muſt be reduced to theſe two: either that all which is to be believed, is not contained in Scripture: and this brings in tradition with them; or, that which is in Scripture is not plainly enough ſet down; and this brings in the queſtion of the infallible Judge. So then, if we be referred to Scripture in point of faith, we need no infallible Church, either for object or infallible reſolution of faith. Now as for the *minor*, that we are referred to Scripture, thoſe texts prove ſufficiently, and he cannot deny it: that we are referred to an infallible Judge, he hath not yet proved: and I deny it.

Yea, what will they ſay, if the laſt text onely proves an *Elench*; Thus. If the cauſe of error be not knowing the Scriptures, then the Scriptures doe plainly contain all things neceſſary: but the cauſe of erring aſſigned here by Chriſt, St. *Mark* 12. 24. 28. is the not knowing of the Scriptures. The *minor* is Scripture, the conſequence alſo would be able to maintain it ſelf, but that they think that we cannot draw a conſequent univerſall from an antecedent particular: for the text there is applyed to a particular point of the Reſurrection.

To

To this we anſwer, firſt, ſimply, we cannot argue an univerſall concluſion from particular premiſſes, becauſe the *genus* contains, potentially, more than one *ſpecies*: but they know that the reſurrection is a main point and comprehenſive of more: ſo that *Aquinas* might well conclude him to be an Heretick that denied the immortallity of the Soul, becauſe ἐν ᾧ παραλαμβάνει he denied the Reſurrection. It includes alſo the Reſurrection of Chriſt, 1. Ep. *Cor.* 15. 13. If there be no Reſurrection from the dead, then Chriſt is not riſen. So then, if by the Scripture we may be right in the knowledge of our Reſurrection, and conſequently in the knowledge of Chriſts Reſurrection, which ſuppoſeth his death, that his Incarnation, his Incarnation God the Father, (as he ſpeaks, if ye had known me ye had known my Father alſo (then it doth plainly enough ſet down that which ſuppoſeth as much as was neceſſary for thoſe in the time of the Law: becauſe they had enough to bring them into the hope of the Reſurrection: unleſſe we ſay with the Socinians, that they had no hope of the Reſurrection. And ſecondly, if the Reſurrection was ſufficiently declared in the old Teſtament, it being ſo fundamentall a point, what reaſon can be given why other points which are alſo neceſſary ſhould not likewiſe be plainly delivered? And thirdly, if that and other points were competently enough revealed in the old Teſtament, that the cauſe of erring was the not knowing of the Scriptures (not the not knowing of the Church) then ſurely the new Teſtament, which is the old revealed, doth ſet down that and other points with ſufficient plainneſſe unto ſalvation. And this is ſufficient to our purpoſe.

As

As for the consequence then from the former Text, which he thinks more probable, that because they did err, *therefore all things necessary to salvation are not plainly set down in Scripture*, I answer, first, he argues *ab esse ad probabile*, which is not rationall: *ab esse ad posse*, is good: But we cannot argue, that because such a thing is come to passe, that therefore it was probable it should: for then because *Adam* did sin, we must say it was probable he should sin; and so he had not been created with a *posse peccare* and a *posse non peccare* in equall freedom: for probability must arise from an inclination. And if they say that the case is different from the fall of man: and therefore depravation by the fall doth *non* incline the power of erring to an actuall error, as the power of sinning unto an actuall sin; we answer, first, that they had not best enlarge the corruption of nature by the fall, lest they bring the Trent Council as to this point in danger of error: and secondly, we say that if they exclude not the grace of God from taking direction by the Church, so neither do we exclude the grace of God from taking direction by the Scripture: and if they say men cannot err, if with grace, or by it, they take the guidance of the Church: then surely with grace, or by grace, it may be as probable not to err through the knowledge of the Scripture; and therefore his consequence of more probability that the Scriptures are not plain because they did err, is vain. Secondly, if those who erred were but a part and sect of the Jews, and those that did not err might be the greater number, (if not the soberer,) then it will follow by his own argument, that this was plainly enough set down in Scripture. Thirdly, he supposeth that which is not to be

be ſuppoſed, if he thinks that we hold things ſo plainly delivered in Scripture, as that we cannot err whether we will keep the way or not: for Scripture doth directly work upon the underſtanding, grace upon the will. It is therefore ſufficient to us to ſay, that things neceſſary are ſo clearly propoſed in Scripture, as that if we be dilligent to know and follow Scripture, we need no infallibility of the Church. Fourthly, he might have been adviſed that this diſcourſe of his will return upon him to the prejudice of their Church: for it ſhould ſeem then, as hath been often noted, things are not ſo plainly defined by their Church, ſince there are ſuch differences amongſt them; even in grand points. Fifthly, we diſtinguiſh betwixt knowledge *in habitu*, and knowledge *in actu*; their habituall knowledge of the Reſurrection in Scripture might be good, and it might be plainly enough exhibited: but they were defective in the actuall knowledge, in not conſidering thoſe principles of Scripture which might have concluded it, according as our Saviour doth upon the place. And ſurely, as the not conſidering is the moral cauſe of moſt of our evil actions (according to that of the Philoſopher πᾶς ἁμαρτάνων ἀγνοεῖ, and therefore alſo ſaith *David*, I have conſidered my ways and turned my feet into thy Teſtimonies) ſo alſo is the not conſidering Scripture, the cauſe of all, or moſt, of our errors: at leaſt the cauſe of the danger in the errors we have: and if they would ſtudy the Scripture affectionately they could not err as they do. The Principles of Scripture are ſufficient unto habituall knowledge; and yet error may come by want of actuall knowledge: either negatively, by not applying them; or worſe, by miſapplying them, they take ſuch opinions firſt as are of uſe

to

to them, then will draw Scripture to them, as is obſerved: but they ſhould apply their opinion to Scripture; not Scripture to their opinion. Sixthly, and laſtly, he did not conſider how near he came to Blaſphemy by comming ſo near to a contradiction of Chriſt: for Chriſt ſays to them *Ye err not knowing the Scriptures*; and his conſequence ſays by conſequence, that they might err though they did know the text, becauſe it doth not plainly ſet down the Reſurrection, whereby he makes either our Saviour to affirm that they could not know the Scripture which our Saviour plainly ſuppoſeth; or elſe that the cauſe of not erring is not to know the Scriptures, as to that point: which how he will anſwer at that great day, I know not.

And ſo his Syllogiſm comes to nothing, or worſe than nothing. *For if all things had been plainly ſet down, they ſhould not have erred: but they erred: therefore all things are not plainly ſet down.* His *major* is falſe. If he takes *ſhould not have erred, ex parte officii*, it is true; but not to his purpoſe: if he takes it *ex parte eventus*, it is to his purpoſe, but not true. It is not falſe, that they might not have erred: but that they could not err, it is falſe: *A poſſe ad non poſſe non non valet.* Means are not always uſed; or not as they ſhould be. We know our duty plainly in many things, yet we do not do it. This argument is good againſt him; men have erred about the ſenſe of the Trent Definitions, as hath been ſaid; therefore all things are not plainly ſet down by the Church: but this Argument is not good againſt us, becauſe we do not allow the form or rule of the argumentation.

His

His other anſwer is as uneffectuall, that *they might err in the knowledge of the Scriptures, becauſe in the reading of them they did follow their own private Interpretation, which is the moſt ready way to err, ſpecially when men oppoſe the publick interpretation of the Church.*

*Anſ.* And doth this conclude contradictorily to this propoſition, that they might not err if they attended to Scripture? Secondly, they might err if they attended to the Church; becauſe, (for ought is yet confirmed) the Church may err: and therefore the ſurer way is to attend to Scripture, which they confeſſe is infallible. Thirdly, if he ſpeaks of oppoſing the publick interpretation of the whole Church, we allow more reverence to the univerſall Church than to theirs. Fourthly, is it neceſſary that every one who cannot ſubmit intuitively to all the definitions of the Church in points of queſtion, ſhould oppoſe the publick interpretation of the whole Church in plain points of faith? Fifthly, *Malediƈta gloſſa quæ corrumpit textum*, This gloſſe corrupts the text: for there is here a limitation of Chriſts words (which elſewhere he accuſeth us of) without any colour from the words of the Text. The Text diſertly repreſents the cauſe of erring in this matter of the reſurrection to be the not knowing of the Scriptures, without any mention of the Church: He will not afford it right, unleſſe we take in alſo obedience to the interpretation of the Church; and his Church too (for otherwiſe he is σοφὸς τὰ ἐκκαιδέκα) which was not then ſurely inveſted with the priviledge of infallibility; which was not inveſted upon them, as ſome of their moſt learned affirm, til after the reſurrection of Chriſt. And therefore if this were true, it were not pertinent. Sixthly, upon this whole matter, it comes to this, that

it is with them better to believe the Church without the Scripture even in plain points, than the Scripture without the Church; for otherwise he comes not up to the ſtate of our queſtion. And how good this Divinity is, let thoſe learned ones of their Church judge, who will thus diſtinguiſh of the Scripture, that it is neceſſary but not ſufficient: which alſo in my opinion is by them intended on the behalf of the Church indeed; but not to bring in a new neceſſity of an infallible Judge in matters of Scripture expreſſed, but to bring in neceſſity of Traditions in matters of Faith not expreſſed.

Num. 13. *Your fifth text is* 2. *Pet.* 1. 19. *We have alſo a more ſure word of Prophecy whereunto you do well, that you take heed as unto a light that ſhineth in a dark place, untill the day dawn and the day-ſtar ariſe in your hearts.*

His exceptions againſt the validitie of this text are two. One, that all things neceſſary to ſalvation are not there ſet down, when S. *Peter* ſpake thoſe words, *becauſe the Canon was not finiſhed.* This we have fully taken away before. The other is thus, how will you prove that *all things neceſſary to ſalvation are plainly ſet down in Scripture, becauſe one thing is plainly ſet down?*

*Anſ.* To this firſt, take that which was ſaid before about the concluding all points neceſſary to be plainly ſet down becauſe that of the Reſurrection is ſo, with the reaſon thereof: and the reaſon is good here alſo, becauſe he ſeems to confeſſe that that one point of *Jeſus being the Son of God and the Meſſias, might clearly be found in Scripture.* This me thinks then we have gained, that one point is clearly ſet down in Scripture. And this it may be conceived he might grant me, becauſe I could draw

no

no consequence from thence against him, for so he insists, *how will you infer ergo all things necessary to salvation are plainly set down in Scripture?* We make use of it thus. If this point be plainly set down in Scripture, then other points also necessarily concerning his being the Messiah must also clearly be set down: so then here is a wheel in a wheel, yea, many inclusively in one: and those also clear: but *verum prius*; as it seems by his own confession. Secondly, if I should serve them with a *quare impedit*; why do they not as well admit other points to be clearly set down in Scripture? what will they say? surely they will say that this point is plainly set down, because it is so necessary. Well then, we reply. If there be degrees of necessaries, then we may be saved in any degree of necessaries. Or, if this be set down onely as necessary; why not all necessaries? For the rule is good, *A quatenus ad omne valet consequentia*: If that clearly set down as necessary, then all things necessary are clearly set down. The same reason is the principle of universality; surely with God; who doth all things in number, weight and measure. For although that *Axiom*, *Idem quæ idem semper facit idem*, doth not always follow as in finite Agents, because they may be defective in their power, and there may be want of disposition in the matter they work upon; but it cannot be said that God wanted ability to set down other points as plainly: and there is no repugnance *ex natura rei*, that other points should be as plainly set down as that; therefore if God in his wisedom and goodnesse, caused by his Spirit that verity to be clearly delivered for our salvation; how can we believe that he did not also direct the Pen-men of the Spirit of God to deliver all other points necessary to salvation with necessary plain-

neſſe? Again thirdly, if the word of the Prophets was a more firme word than the Teſtimonies of the Apoſtles (as *Eſtius* upon the place) as to the Jewes for the faith in the Meſſiah, then where we have that and the writings of the Apoſtles in the new, why ſhould we not account this a more ſure word than the word of the Church in this point, or any other contained in Scripture? Why may not we as likely doubt of the Church, ſpecially a particular Church, as well as the Jews might doubt of the Apoſtles? And is not the Doctrine of the old and new Teſtament more ſure than the Doctrine of the Church? To the Law and to the Teſtimony, if they ſpeak not according to this, it is becauſe there is no light in them; as the Prophet ſpeaks: then the Scripture is the rule of their Doctrine, and therefore more ſure; that which gives credit to others muſt be more credible. Yea, and untill they prove that ſomething new in ſubſtance was added to the new Teſtament above what was contained in the old, that text availes alſo for Chriſtians, againſt any thing not written. Neither can the Romaniſt ſay, that that word of Prophecy *ſhines in a dark place* by the hand of man in the Church: for it is ſpoken of the word as written: and the Prophets who then wrote the word were dead. If the Prophets had been then living, it had been reaſonable for the Jews to have taken their direction from their mouth, as it might be reaſonable for us to take the word of God from the mouth of the Apoſtles, were they now living: but the Prophets are dead, and the Apoſtles are dead; by whom we know God ſpake: but that God ſpeaks now by the Church as he did by them, we are yet to deny untill it be better proved; or theſe texts better anſwered. But we have one more. *Your*

*Your ſixth and laſt text is Acts the 17. where it is ſaid of the Bereans, they received the word with all readineſſe of mind, and ſearched the Scripture daily whether thoſe things were ſo.* Num. 14.

Againſt the proceedings of this Text he brings ſeverall Pleas: ſome common to former Texts, as at the latter end of the number: theſe are anſwered already: thoſe that are new we ſhall here examine. And firſt he calls for *one evident clear ſyllable which ſaith the Bereans did ſearch the Scripture before they believed St.* Paul. *Nay, is it not firſt ſaid, they received the word with all readineſſe of mind?*

*Anſ.* Firſt he ſays that which is to be proved, that thoſe words, *they received the word with all readineſſe of mind*, do inferr rather that they did believe St. *Paul* before they did ſearch the Scriptures: For though St. *Paul* was infallible in his Doctrine, and therefore might be believed, and ought, yet it doth not appear that they were perſwaded of him: and therefore it is not ſaid they recieved St. *Paul* with all readineſſe of mind, but they received the word: and they might receive it with all chearfulneſſe as good, though they did ſearch it, whether true. Secondly, they might receive it with all readineſſe upon appearance of probability, although they did not believe it, until by ſearch they found it agreeable to the Scriptures. Yea, ſomewhat may be received without probability, and with all readineſſe of mind too, as an Adverſaries paper: And that they did not believe it untill they had compared it with the writings of the Apoſtles appears more probable by the following words, that they did daily ſearch the Scriptures, if theſe things were ſo: their ſearch was *an ſit*; εἰ ἔχει ταῦτα ὕτως.

If

If they did believe, why did they ſtill ſearch and daily ſearch? Doe we ſearch for that which infallibly we believe? Then where is certainty, which Mr. *Knot* makes neceſſary to faith? But he himſelf will ingenuouſly confeſſe as much as ſeems requiſite for our cauſe, in theſe words, *upon thoſe motives which St.* Paul *propoſed to them before they ſearched the Scriptures, and being by thoſe motives and Inſtructions well enlightned to underſtand the Scriptures, they for their further comfort and confirmation, ſearched the Scriptures daily, to ſee whether they teſtifyed the ſame point, and this one point of our Saviours comming being clearly in Scripture, perhaps St.* Paul *might bid them ſearch in ſuch and ſuch texts for it.*

Theſe words we muſt take great notice of: what *motives* they were he doth not expreſſe; but ſuch it ſeems, as *upon which many thouſands did* recieve it (*whoſe proceedings you can never prove leſſe laudable than the Beræans*) But this his parentheſis does *captiously*. He might have left it out better. For why then are theſe Beræans commended? If there was not in them ſomewhat of excellent ingenuity, why are they commended for this, that they received the word with all chearfulneſſe, ſearching the Scriptures daily? Doth not this belong alſo to their commendation, that they ſearched the Scriptures daily? Nay, it may be, further, if we may have leave to be critical, their receiving of the word with all chearfulneſſe was concurrent with the ſearching of the Scriptures daily: and ſo the participle [ἀναζητοῦντες] is to be taken *per modum medii*; whereby they came to embrace the word: the uſe of Participles is not, it may be, infrequent in this ſenſe. However, it is not comely

comely for him, when the Scripture doth give a reputation and honor to theſe Bereæans, to equalize many thouſands to them.

But we muſt a little more reflect upon his words. Motives theſe Bereæans had propoſed by St. *Paul* before they ſearched the Scriptures. But what motives? That is not expreſſed by St. *Paul*, nor indeed that they had any: Well, but we give it, that they had motives. And if the authority of the Church had been one of thoſe motives, my Adverſary would not have omitted it. And yet alſo we can grant motives before the reſolution of faith: So that thoſe Bereæans might have motives, and yet not believe before the ſearching of the Scriptures.

But this how loath is he to come to, that they did ſearch the Scriptures, as in order to believing: Therefore he doth ſubſtitute other ends of their ſearching of the Scriptures; namely. *for their comfort and confirmation.* What? For their comfort and confirmation, and not for their faith? But if the ſearhing of the Scriptures be of uſe to our *comfort and confirmation*, then alſo to our faith: but not to beget it, it may be. No? As in naturalls ſo in ſpirituals, we may be ſaid to be nouriſhed by that by which we conſiſt, Therefore it is ſaid, *Rom* 10. 17. Faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God. And if it be ſaid that it comes by the word of God ſpoken: It is anſwered, the word of God ſpoken is to be meaſured now by the word of God written, unleſſe we had as good reaſon to believe thoſe that now ſpeak in the Church, as the Jews had to believe the Prophets, or the firſt Chriſtians the Apoſtles. But ſecondly, if the ſearching of the Scriptures was of uſe for the *com-*

*fort*

*fort and confirmation* of them, then this brings more honor upon the Scriptures, becauſe this is more to be comforted and confirmed by them: for comfort at leaſt, reſpects the application of the Goſpell to us; and if the ſearching of the Scripture be of uſe hereunto, as in the way of a particular faith: then ſurely to a generall faith much more. Thirdly, therefore if he means by *comfort* particular aſſurance, then he turns Proteſtant in this opinion: if not, he will be little differing from faith. But fourthly, theſe Berœans were here commended for ſearching the Scriptures, whether to *comfort and confirmation*, or to faith: and therefore ſurely we cannot be diſcommended hereafter for allowing the uſe of the Bible to the people.

But this he occurrs to: *Neither hence is it made evident, that the old Teſtament was thruſt into every mans hand of the Berœans, but that they deputed their chief Doctors to make this ſearch, and that for this point onely*: namely, our Saviours comming, which, he even now ſaid, is *clearly in Scripture*: Well, as we have noted, we have here the main and denominative point of Chriſtians, by his confeſſion, *clearly in Scripture*: but the old Teſtament was not thruſt into the hands of every man of the Berœans, no, not to ſearch them as to this one point: Oh, how tender they are here in this matter! *Si non caſte tamen caute.* But was it put into the hands of any of the Berœans? if ſo, why not into the hands of all? If not, ſhall the Berœans in the text ſuppoſe onely for the Doctors, and for none of the People? But ſome it may be would have abuſed the Scripture: and would none of the Doctors? no, will he ſay, not in a clear point: but

but would the Doctors then in a controverted point? If so, how should we be ruled by them? Yea, neither the people would have abused the Scriptures in a clear point, by his own Argument: becaule *they erred, therefore it is not plainly set down.* So then if this point, about our Saviors coming, be plainly in Scripture, as he cannot but acknowledge; it seems then the people could not err in it. But then again secondly, it is not like to be meant of the Doctors, because it being a plain point in Scripture, there was no need for them to search the Scriptures daily: Therefore most certainly it is meant of the people: for the Doctors also are not wont to be spoken of in a common notion of the nation. Thirdly, it is to be understood of these Berœaus in opposition to the Thessalonians, as appears by the text, *these were more noble* (or more ingenuous) *than those of Thessalonica*: now these in *Thessalonica* were not of the Doctors: for it is meant of the Synagogue there, as appears by compare of the first verse of the ch. and the fifth with the rest. And so also those who are spoken of in *Berœa*, were also of the Synagogue of the Jews there, as appears by the tenth verse: now the Synagogue was not a Congregation of Doctors, but of the people, with a Master. And so it was a rule with the Jew, ten make a people: and where there is a people, there is to be a Synagogue: and where a Synagogue, there a Master. So then this being spoken of them of the Synagogue *per se*, it is most like to be understood, *de communi*, of the people. And fourthly, if it were to be understood of the Doctors, I hope the people should have belie-

ved them upon their own word, without the Doctors ſearching the Scriptures daily. For if the Doctors be not to be believed without their ſearching of the Scriptures daily, then, for ought I ſee, we have done; and the Controverſie betwixt us is at an end: becauſe it is to no purpoſe, that their ſearching of the Scriptures ſhould be a condition of the peoples belief, unleſſe alſo the people be allowed to give their belief conditionately to the ſearch: and how can this be done by them, unleſſe they compare what is ſaid by the Doctors with the Scriptures. For how ſhall we believe the Doctors upon their bare word that they have ſearched the Scriptures? ſo then, in effect, upon this account, the main principle and laſt reſolutive of the peoples faith muſt be the Doctors meer word: and why then ſhould they diſcourſe fallibly, and conclude infallibly, as *Stapleton* would have it?

To conclude then the debate of this text; we may have, I ſuppoſe, clearly, theſe two corollaries from it. Firſt, that it is not onely lawfull, but commendable, whatſoever the Church ſays, to ſearch the Scriptures whether thoſe things be ſo: for the Church cannot have greater authority upon us than St. *Paul:* (no, nor ſo much neither, till they prove it better) and yet theſe Berœans were commended for it. And if in a point clearly ſet down in Scripture, (as this was by his own acknowledgement) then in other points much rather, becauſe (by his own argument alſo) in ſuch the Doctors may be more miſtaken: Yea, becauſe alſo, according to our principles, poſitive faith in ſuch points is not ſo neceſſary to ſalvation untill we ſee it plainly pro-

propoſed. Yea alſo, when a point controverted appears plain, the diſbelief is not damnative by the nature of the verity; but becauſe it deſtroys Gods veracity; which is the prime tenure of all truth. Secondly, we have alſo this Corollary, that faith comes by ſearching of the Scriptures: for ſo it follows (which my Adverſary had no mind to take notice of) in the very next verſe, the twelfth, *many of them therefore believed*. Therefore; namely, upon ſearching of the Scriptures: ſo that they did not believe blindely, and then ſearched the Scriptures; but ſearched the Scriptures firſt, and then rationally, upon principles of Scripture, believed. And theſe two propoſitions are ſufficient to unhinge the Pope and all his Cardinalls, and all their Religion, as differing.

So that now the texts (whereunto he would wiſely have anſwered out of due place) being vindicated from his batteries, and ſtanding againſt him in their full ſtrength and force, we may now, after this reinforcement of them, make ſhorter worke: having already given him more than he brings.

And therefore as for his Argument in this Par. That this is not plainly ſet down in Scripture, [that all things neceſſary to ſalvation are plainly ſet down in Scripture] and therefore not all things, is anſwered by our deniall of the Antecedent; and the proof of the contrary. For the moment of thoſe texts defended doth ſufficiently confirm the Scriptures ſufficiency in matter and manner to this end of ſalvation. We do not ſay, that *all things neceſſary to decide all Controverſies are plainly ſet down in it*: that is not our aſſertion, nor Num. 15.

nor the ſtate of the queſtion betwixt us. Our poſition may be true, and yet this falſe: for all things neceſſary to ſalvation may be plainly ſet down in Scripture, and yet not all things neceſſary to decide all Controverſies. Neither can they maintain this of their Church, which they think more fit to decide Controverſies than Scripture, for then why did not the Trent Council clearly determine on which part many queſtions ſhould be held? But the plainneſſe of things neceſſary is in Scripture ſufficient againſt the neceſſity of any Controverſie; as the fulneſſe is ſufficient againſt the neceſſity of Tradition, which is their word unwritten. And therefore are not we bound by any neceſſity of our cauſe to find any Text wherein we are obliged to *take the Scripture for our onely Judge of Controverſies*: for the texts before maintained are good to prove us obliged to Scripture for ſalvation; whereunto things neceſſary are plainely ſet down. If he might have made the ſtate of the queſtion for his own turn; my diſcourſe ſhould have been impertinent. A ruffling Adverſary would have ſaid that he had ſhifted and ſhuffled in the change of the queſtion, as if we had held, that the Scripture did contain all things neceſſary to decide all Controverſies. All *prime Controverſies* neceſſary to ſalvation, if there need be any, it doth: and that is ſufficient for us againſt them.

But he thought he had deviſed a way how this opinion might be made good, that the Scripture doth ſuffice for the deciding of all Controverſies; thus; *Yet the Scripture wanteth not that glory of being ſufficient to decide all imagi-*

*nable*

*nable Controverſies, becauſe ſhe teacheth us that Chriſt hath erected a Church built upon a rock, the pillar and ground of truth, having the Spirit of truth abiding with her to teach her all truth.* O excellent proviſion for the honor of Scripture! One in the Trent Council, as I remember, did not like references; but would have all done uniformely by the ſame hand: but we muſt from Scripture referr to the Church. And as it is ſaid of Cardinall *Bellarmin*, that being asked a queſtion too difficult, ſaid, he could not tell how to anſwer it, but he would ſhew the party one that could; and then ſhewed him the picture of an excellent Divine: ſo the Scripture cannot anſwer all Controverſies: but it hath reputation in this, that it can ſhew, and doth, an infallible Judge of all *imaginable Controverſies*, the Church. To this, firſt, methinks then, if it were but for this uſe, the Scripture ſhould be more common to the Laitie: becauſe it ſheweth ſo clearly this Judge. Secondly, let them ſhew unto us where the Scriptture doth plainly ſhew unto us this Judge; that they may no longer beg the queſtion. And Thirdly, let them tell us why the Church doth not determin all Controverſies, as we have ſaid before; not *imaginable* onely, but reall Controverſies; as concerning the Popes power in compare with a Council, and concerning his temporall power: and concerning the right of Biſhops: concerning original ſin: concerning the conception of the Virgin: were theſe determined with ſatisfaction to all the Members of the Council? Fourthly, doth the Scripture give the denomination of this Church, which is the pillar and ground of all truth, that ſhould

ſhould be the infallible Judge? Fifthly, if they think the *Spirit of truth* doth abide with the Church, to decide all Controverſies by way of an habituall gift, then muſt this Church have more priviledge than the Apoſtles had; for they had the Spirit by way of a tranſient gift, and therefore ſome particular queſtions they did not decide by the gift of the Spirit: but the Church muſt have a ſtanding faculty to decide all *imaginable* Controverſies. Sixthly, may not we as well ſay, this is for the glory of the Church for neceſſaries to ſalvation, that it ſends us to the Scripture which is infallible, and clear enough in things of neceſſary faith? This honour the Fathers, before the univerſal Biſhop, gave to the Scriptures: the Romaniſts now would arrogate it to the Church. If they muſt be brought to a Competition; which, in ingenuity, ſhould carry the honour, the Scripture according to the Fathers, or the Church according to the Romaniſts?

But he thinks, according to his principles, he is not engaged to finde a plaine Text, where this is ſet down, that the *Church* ſhould *decide, with infallible authoritie, all our Controverſies*; becauſe, according to them, *all points neceſſary to ſalvation be not plainly ſet down.*

*Anſw.* Then firſt, according to our principles, we are not bound to believe it: and we muſt account it no neceſſary to ſalvation, becauſe it is not plainly ſet down. And how then ſhall we know it? what by its own light? or may we know the Church by Scripture, and not the infallibility, which is the priviledge? Secondly, How then could he ſay by Scripture, that God hath provided *a way ſo direct that fooles cannot err?*

*err?* Thirdly, if he confeſſe that there is not a clear text which ſheweth this priviledge of, and our duty to the Church, then the diſputation is at an end: for he will not diſpute with me from the teſtimony of the Fathers, for cauſes beſt known to himſelf. And if he ſayes, we muſt be judged by the Church; it is the queſtion. Fourthly, therefore are we in this agreed, which is the main point of the queſtion; namely, that the Scripture doth not plainly ſet it down, that the Church *is to decide, with infallible authority, all our Controverſies.* For, if it were plainly ſet down, we alſo ſhould be bound to believe it, as being plainly ſet downe, though it would not therefore be neceſſary to ſalvation, ſimply becauſe it is plainly delivered. All neceſſaries are plainly ſet down, according to our opinion: but all that is plainly ſet down is not neceſſary to ſalvation, *ex natura principii.* And then fifthly, if he doubts of this point, as to be plainly ſet down in Scripture, then his principles are leſs capable of certainty than ours: for he hath no ground certain of his faith, upon the account of the Church; becauſe, if the Church did ground her infallibility upon her owne authority contradiſtinctly to Scripture, ſhe could not, by her owne authority, contradiſtinctly to Scripture, prove that ſhe is αὐτόπιστον: and yet neither hath the Church, or their Church, (for ought I have read) in any of their Councils, determined it ſelfe by Scripture, or otherwiſe, infallible to the deciſion of all *imaginable Controverſies.* Nay, neither do *Bellarmin* or *Stapleton*, if I be not miſtaken, aſſert the infallibility of the Church in this extent; therefore my Adverſary in this walks alone.

Yet

Yet he ſays the texts he will produce hereafter are an *hundred times more clear, that the Church is to decide all our Controverſies, than that the Scripture by it ſelf alone is to decide them.*

*Anſ.* This comes not home to the point. For firſt, we goe not upon degrees of claritude, but upon infallibility. Can they tell us how many degrees of claritude will make infallibility? Secondly, *All our Controverſies* are not ſo much as all *imaginable Controverſies*: there are other Controverſies imaginable beſides ours. Thirdly, he ſuppoſeth that of us which is not true of us, that we affirm the Scripture to decide our Controverſies formally: which we ſay not: we ſay again, that for things neceſſary to be believed there is no need of Controverſie, becauſe they are plainly delivered: for other Controverſies there is no need, as to ſalvation, that they ſhould be decided, becauſe they are not neceſſarily to be believed. And alſo for ſome of their opinions, they are in effect decided, namely, in a negative manner, becauſe they are not mentioned in Scripture: and therefore *percutit Dei gladius*, as the Father ſpeaks; the ſword of God ſtrikes them off. Fourthly, he is brought to a pinch: he would fain have the authority of the Scripture for the infallible deciſion of the Church: yet becauſe the point is not ſo clear as to amount to our infallibility of their infallibility, he puts it upon degrees of claritude.

But if it comes to degrees of claritude betwixt the Scripture for the Church, or the Scripture for it ſelf, who ſhall compare and judge? the Church? this is the queſtion, and it is a partie. And perſons are partiall: the Law not. And would not they have

have men determine for the Church? Yes verily: and he thinks with good reason, then he allows them, as is observed by Mr. *Chillingworth*, a judgement of private discretion for the Church out of Scripture, but not for the Scripture out of Scripture. Fifthly, he differs from his own party in this, for they think it demonstrable out of Scripture, that the Church is with infallible authority to decide all Controversies. And how else can [the *Roman*] in their Trent Confession, be added to the Catholick and Apostolick Church? And how did they by their Authority determine that the Latine Bible, which came out first by *Sextus Quintus*, afterwards corrected by *Clement* the eighth, (though the former by them infallible) should be the Judge and Decider of all Controversies? So that, by the way, although the Scripture in the originall be not a Decider of Controversies, yet in Latine it may.

——*sed te.*
*Nos facimus* [*Romana*] *Deam cæloq; locamus.*

His texts of more claritude for the Church come in afterwards, as he says, n. 58, &c.

To passe by here that which is not materiall, and also that which is spoken of here to be managed by him hereafter in other numbers of this ch. (which might give us an Alarum, when they come nearer us.) He says here, he might have added to other points necessary not plainly decided by Scripture, *that great point, whether it be necessary to rebaptize those who are baptized by Hereticks.* And this we will not here passe by unsaluted, because we give reverence to St. *Austins* testi- Num. 16.

mony produced by him upon the point. We therefore anſwer, but with ſome expoſtulation, why doth this come in here? was the latter written before the former? There is ſome myſtery in it: but we paſſe it. We muſt anſwer therefore, firſt, that he miſtakes the queſtion which he is upon: it is not this, whether the Scripture doth plainly decide whether ſuch a thing be neceſſary or not, but whether it doth decide plainly that which is neceſſary. Now here he laies it down as a queſtion undecided by Scripture, *Whether it be neceſſary to rebaptize thoſe who are baptized by Hereticks.* To determin a thing which is neceſſary, and to determine whether the thing be neceſſary, are ſurely two things; the former reſpects the thing as in it ſelf which part is true: the latter reſpects the thing *in modo*, and in order to the end, either of obedience or ſalvation. Therefore ſecondly, we diſtinguiſh of [neceſſary,] it hath relation either to duty, or to ſalvation: the former is the neceſſity of the precept: the latter of the mean. The former (if ſuppoſed) doth not infer the neceſſity of the knowledge of this point: becauſe we may be ſaved without the knowledge of every thing which is commanded by God, by generall Repentance. Otherwiſe no man could be ſaved: for no man living knows every thing which is commanded, therefore invincible ignorance muſt excuſe actuall repentance. Now the ſecond neceſſity doth infer a neceſſity of knowledge; becauſe, without the knowledge of neceſſary means, we cannot obtain our end. He is therefore to prove it neceſſary to ſalvation to know which part of the Contradiction is right, to rebaptize or not; which he cannot do, becauſe the

the practice on either part is not neceſſary by neceſſity of mean. And the practice on either part is not neceſſary by neceſſity of mean; becauſe then either thoſe Churches which differed from St. *Cyprian*, or thoſe that held with him, were in extream peril of damnation; which I think they will not ſay. Wherefore, if either part be neceſſary to be believed, the neceſſity is not *ex vi materiæ*, but *ex vi proponendi*; upon the clearneſſe of the propoſing it. Now that which is neceſſary to be believed in the latter kind, doth not belong to our queſtion: for the queſtion is of thoſe things which are to be believed neceſſarily in order to ſalvation, not neceſſarily to be believed in order to the propoſall; but this clear propoſall is not neceſſary, becauſe the practice on either part is not neceſſary to ſalvation; and therefore this is no neceſſary queſtion. And this diſtinction is ſufficient to deſtroy at leaſt the moſt of all his inſtances of this kind. And thirdly, my Adverſary needed not, as to himſelf, to have made this a queſtion, by reaſon of the practice of their Church: for they account us Hereticks; and yet when we come over to them, they do not rebaptize us. And if they ſay, it is now determined by the Church in the negative; we anſwer, it is not yet determined by the Church whether it was neceſſary to be determined by the Church in order to ſalvation: for then it was neceſſary to ſalvation not to be rebaptized; and it was neceſſary to ſalvation to know it: the former puts St. *Cyprian* in danger for the evil practice: the latter puts him in danger for want of neceſſary knowledge. And therefore the former part of St. *Auſtin's* teſtimony

hereunto is not appositly produced: for the question now is not whether it be *openly or evidently read in Scripture*; because we confesse it is not; but the question is of the necessity of it to be known. Let then the moment of this discourse be resolved into form, thus: This is necessary to be known, on which part the truth stands: this is not known by Scripture; therefore somewhat not known by Scripture is necessry to be known; we answer, first, we deny the syllogism, because it is not an *Elench*, a contradictory syllogism: for it should conclude something necessary to salvation which is not known in Scripture: And if this be put into the *major* proposition, that it is *necessary* to salvation to be known, we utterly deny it untill it be well proved; which we think will never be.

And to that which follows of St. *Austin's* testimony in the nineteenth ch. (not the twenty second) *de Unit. Ecclesiæ*, we, consequently, can easily make answer, even by saying as he, that, *If there were any wise man of whom our Saviour had given testimony that he should be consulted in this question, we would make no doubt to perform that he should say, lest we should seem not to gainsay him so much as to gainsay Christ, by whose testimony he was recommended, now Christ beareth witnesse to his Church*: therefore. But what then? What is this to our purpose? For first, this informs us what should be done, but not upon what necessity, whether to salvation or not. In things of question we deny not all due respect to the Church: but we are upon things necessary to salvation; and amongst such, this point is out of question.

queſtion no queſtion. But ſecondly, thoſe that ſhould be *conſulted* with, ſhould be believed in proportion to Scripture; ſhould they not? yes, ſurely becauſe Chriſt hath given teſtimony to his Church, in Scripture; and if we are to take the teſtimony of the Church from Scripture, then are we to give credence to what is ſaid in analogie to Scripture: Now though it be not *openly and evidently read* in Scripture, as he ſays: yet there may be ſome ſeeds as it were, in Scripture, of it, whereupon the Concluſion might riſe. And therefore where Scripture hath the principle, we give belief to the Concluſion in reſpect thereunto. Yea, the prime and formall reaſon of believing the Church muſt come from Scripture, by which there in that book, St. *Auſtin* doth prove the Catholick Church: ſo that if the Church be credible by the Scripture, then the Scripture is more credible. But thirdly, this is ſaid by the Father of the Catholick Church, not of a part of it: and therefore they cannot conclude from hence to the Roman Church. For it being underſtood of the whole Church, as ſuch; a part as a part hath no part in it, but as it agrees to the whole. Neither is it ſaid of the Catholick Church for place then, but alſo the Catholick for time: and yet if for the Catholick then, we cannot equally draw it to the Catholick for place now; for the Catholick morally was more credible then than now. And fourthly, as he hath excepted againſt the concluding unto all points from the Scriptures concluding one: ſo we, *ad hominem*, deny that he can conclude from the Church unto all points, becauſe St. *Auſtin* uſeth it for one point againſt the

the Donatiſts. And as he argued from the Catholick againſt the Donatiſts a perverſe part which would have ſalvation onely within their circuit in *Africa*: ſo may we argue from the Catholick Church againſt the Roman, which will have all ſubject to their Communion, or damnation.

And then alſo may we limit that which follows, *Whoſoever refuſeth to follow the practice of the Church doth reſiſt our Saviour himſelfe, who by his teſtimony commends the Church.* This, reſpecting things of Diſcipline againſt Schiſme, may be good: but what is this to univerſal and abſolute aſſent in point of faith? And it concernes the Catholick Church, as before; not the Romane: or, if it did concern the Church of *Rome* then; yet *dato, non conceſſo*: it doth not at all avail to the Church of *Rome* now.

As for his diſtinction of uſing this Teſtimony, *Not for the authority of S.* Auſtin, *(with whom I am ſo little ſatisfied) but for the convincing reaſon.* We anſwer, that this is but a flouriſh, yet wiſely made, leſt he ſhould be as well engaged to anſwer the teſtimonies of the Fathers againſt them: I ſay then, that we give more reſpect to the Fathers than indeed they do when they differ from them: and we give as much as the Fathers deſire for themſelves. And why have they themſelves then left ſome practices of the Church: as unction with Baptiſm; ſtanding up in prayer betwixt Eaſter and Whitſontide; Infant Communion, and others? But I ſhall conclude this Number with S. *Auſtin*'s Reaſon, *mutatis mutandis*, *Whoſoever refuſeth to follow* the Doctrine of Scripture in things neceſſary, *reſiſteth our Saviour*

*viour himſelfe, who by his teſtimony commends*, and commands to us the Scripture. Let him think of this who is an *Impugner* of the ſufficiency of Scripture.

To paſs by his ſuppoſitions of his proofe, which are already nulled by me: he doth here take notice of my charging him with a contradiction *in adjecto*, for ſaying, we ſhould ſubmit to the infallible Judge, whatſoever Reaſons we have to the contrary: But this he doth not ingenuouſly deliver, as it was delivered by me; and yet, in effect, ſaies nothing to it, but that I do ill ſuppoſe any ſolid Reaſons grounded in Scripture againſt ſuch a Judge. And this is all he would ſay to make out my charge againſt him of a Contradiction *in adjecto*; leaving out thoſe words of mine, *for it is impoſſible for us in our judgements to aſſent to that for which we ſee reaſons of Scripture to the contrary, &c.* Num. 17.

May I not ſay, that this was not fair dealing? but to let this paſs: if he can yet prove, or any for him, *ſuch a Judge to be the Pillar and Ground of Truth, whoſe tongue is directed by the ſame Spirit who directed the Pen of thoſe who writ the Scripture*, then indeed I ſhould ſuppoſe that which could not be: but this I deny to be proveable by all the wit of *Rome*; and therefore I ſtill hold my ſuppoſition: and yet if this could be made good, I ſhould yield my ſuppoſition; yet I could not reverſe my charge againſt him of the contradiction *in adjecto*, which lies not in the ſuppoſition of Reaſons out of Scripture againſt ſuch a Judge; but in this, that we muſt ſubmit to ſuch a Judge, *whatſoever Reaſons* we have out of Scripture to the contrary: For if there could be any ſuch

Judge

Judge proved, there could not be Reaſons out of Scripture to the contrary. And Reaſon out of Scripture will binde beliefe againſt any proof. It would not onely put a demurr againſt proofe, but prevail againſt it: and if the proofe were out of Scripture, then there ſhould be a contradiction in Scripture: for there ſhould be reaſon for ſuch a Judge, and reaſon againſt it; and ſo the Scripture ſhould not be infallible: which they confeſs.

Num. 18. But this not right dealing with what I wrote ſhall not anſwer for the miſuſage of *Bellarmin*, that he here accuſeth me of; becauſe I ſaid, *If we are by duty to go the way of abſolute obedience to the dictates of the Judge, we muſt then, if he ſays vices are vertues, ſay ſo too, as your Cardinall Bellarmin determins.*

This he makes a calumny; becauſe he thinks it as impoſſible for the Pope to ſay that vices are vertues, *as if God the Father ſhould ſay, ſuch a thing was a vertue, and Chriſt ſhould preach ſuch a thing was a vice.*

*Anſ.* It would do well, as he ſaid, to uſe ſoft words and hard arguments; waving therefore his reflexions, we ſay, firſt, the *calumnie* is not in ſaying of him what he ſayes not: but in the miſ-interpretation how he ſpeaks it. And to this we ſay; it is not neceſſary to be a calumny, for, it may be ſpoken of him, as it was ſpoken by him, in way of ſuppoſition, and may be ſpoken of him to be ſpoken by him. And therefore if it was no calumny in the Cardinall

nall to ſay ſo, it may be no calumny in me to ſay of the Cardinall, that he ſaid ſo. They will think a notionall ſuppoſition makes no ſlander, whoſoever be the ſubject, and whatſoever the predicate; and therefore if he thinks that I muſt ſpeak it of *Bellarmin* ſlanderouſly, he muſt alſo think that *Bellarmin* might ſpeak it ſo too.

Secondly, if it were as impoſſible to ſuppoſe any ſuch thing of the Pope, as *that God ſhould ſay ſuch a thing is a virtue, and Chriſt ſhould preach it to be a vice*; Then why hath the Pope ſuch a Council to aſſiſt him? It is well put into more hands for fear of a defectibilitie in one. And if it be ſaid, that this was ſpoken of the Pope only hypothetically to his ſaying ſo, as being aſſiſted with a Council; it is eaſily anſwered, that this is not the Jeſuits opinion, that the Pope is infallible onely with a Council. And by the way, if a Pope be infallible onely with a Council, why did Pope *Clement* ſay, that a Council was always good, but when it medled with the Popes authority? Is there any point more conſiderable than the Popes authority? And is he onely infallible in a Council? and yet is he afraid that this point ſhould be meddled with in a Council? Then he muſt ſuſpect his own cauſe in their opinion.

Well, and can God err, or can Chriſt err *in precepts, and particular judgements*, as *Bellarmin* confeſſeth in the ſame chap.? *it is not abſurd that the Pope ſhould err.* And can God or Chriſt err in commanding any thing *unprofitable, or under too heavy a puniſhment?* It is not abſurd to ſay this of the Pope, although it belongs not

to ſubjects to doubt of this, but ſimply to obey, as he ſays in the ſame chap.

Nay, if to ſpeak ſo of the Pope, as *Bellarmin ſays*, in way of ſuppoſition, were a ſlander, then *Bellarmin* ſlanders the Pope alſo in his ſecond *b. de Rom. Pontif. cap. 29. Itaque ſicut licet reſiſtere Pontifici, &c.* Therefore, as it is lawfull to reſiſt the Pope invading our body, ſo is it lawfull to reſiſt him invading ſouls, and troubling a Commonwealth; and much rather, *Si Eccleſiam deſtruere niteretur*, if he ſhould endeavour to deſtroy the Church. Thus he. Then he ſhall defend me: therefore may I be clear of ſlander againſt *Bellarmin*; or he guilty of ſlander againſt the Pope.

But then thirdly, put caſe I account it no ſlander againſt the Pope to affirm a poſſibility in him to ſay that vice is virtue. The Conſequence, I hope, is good *ab eſſe ad poſſe*, he hath done ſo, therefore is it poſſible. To command diſobedience to Chriſt, under colour of obedience to him, is to ſay really that vice is virtue: and this the Pope hath done in the injunction of his dimi-Communion; as before. And let them, before they preſſe this ſlander any further, firſt, help *Bellarmin* to purge the Pope of all thoſe errors in faith, and determinations affirmative againſt Gods precepts negative in point of practice. And when they have done this, then we ſhall be afraid to ſuppoſe a poſſibility, if we cannot find further inſtances of fact. And therefore they ſhall not ſcare us with a charge of calumnie, untill they have ſtrongly aſſerted ſuch an impoſſibility. Indeed *impoſſibi-*

*lis*

*in conditio facit negativam*: we cannot err in obedience if we cannot err in commanding; but that he cannot err in commands, is yet *ſub judice*, and not himſelf.

*All Proteſtants do ſay (as I noted) that the Scripture, and onely the Scripture is left us by Chriſt for our Judge to end all Controverſies.* Num. 19.

*Anſ.* This is no genuine account of our opinion. They do not aſſert the Scripture to be a Judge in formalities. They ſay there is no need of ſuch a Judge, as Papiſts would have; ſince all neceſſaries unto faith and hope and charity, are ſufficiently delivered in matter and form, without any exigence of ſuch a Judge. And in this they agree with all right Catholicks; not *with Hereticks*, as he would have it. And Hereticks, he may know, as before, have urged the Church for them: and St. *Auſtin* hath dealt with Hereticks by Scripture, and therefore if Hereticks uſe the Scripture, muſt we not? ſince Hereticks urge the Church, by his argument, they muſt not, they know the rule, *Duo cum idem faciunt non eſt idem.*

*It is one thing to uſe Scripture for the proof of ſome points, and another thing to ſay Scripture, and onely Scripture, muſt be the Judge for all Controverſies: To what end then is all you ſay againſt me as againſt one miſliking the uſe of Scripture?*

*Anſ.* This is all I have from him in account to five or ſix anſwers I gave him to the charge againſt me, for uſing Scripture as Hereticks do. Thus

eaſily he puts me off. Well, to this put-off, we ſay, firſt, that this diſtinction of his imports a confeſſion of his to uſe Scripture in ſome points; then is not the propoſall of the Church neceſſary to all points? and this is ſome abatement of his former univerſality. Secondly, thoſe points he allows the uſe of Scripture in are neceſſary, as was intimated before, ſince *Bellarmin* doth own the Scripture for a rule alſo. And if Scripture doth deliver ſome points neceſſary, *quatenus tales*; then all neceſſaries, as before, neither need theſe neceſſaries be many, as Mr. *Chillingworth* hath obſerved: and *Tertullian* alſo in effect, *Certa ſunt in paucis*. The rule of faith uſed by the Fathers was not numerous in particulars. Thirdly, we ſay, not that the Scripture is a proper Judge, much leſſe *for all Controverſies*. And therefore if they will ſtand to what is here ſaid by them, and withdraw that which is not duly ſaid of us, let them take the Counters and caſt up the difference betwixt us. They allow the Scripture in ſome points: we allow the Church in ſome points: they allow the Scripture, I ſuppoſe in ſome points neceſſary, we allow the Church much in points not neceſſary. If they would extend *ſome points* neceſſary, to all points neceſſary (which are not many; we, not upon condition, but freely would give the Church due reverence in points of queſtion, and thus there would be ſoon an end of the Controverſies betwixt us, and in all the world alſo. For all differences do ariſe either in Doctrine or Diſcipline; (if we take Doctrine as extendible not onely to points of ſimple faith, but alſo to points of practice.) For then the Scripture ſhould rule

us

us in points of Doctrine: and the Church in point of Diſcipline, unto peace.

But his fair terms will not grow into a compoſition. For he argues, that the Scripture cannot be the Judge of Hereticks, thus. *All Offendors againſt the Law will never be ſo much their own Condemnors as to chuſe, on their own accord, a Judge by whom they know they ſhall clearly be condemned: therefore when we ſee all Offendors againſt God's Law in point of Hereſie, chuſe on their own accord to be judged by Scriptures, it is a manifeſt ſign that they know they ſhall never be condemned clearly by Scripture.*

*Anſ.* This diſcourſe in form ſeems an Enthymem, but in effect is a Syllogiſm, if we take a *minor* out of the conſequent. To the *major* therefore we ſay, we are not here to examin what an Offendor would do to ſave his life, but what we ſhould doe to ſave our ſouls. The queſtion is of duty, which we ſhould be judged by. Nay, ſecondly, the Offendor ought morally to refer himſelf to his right Judge notwithſtanding his danger: and in hereſie we offend againſt the fundamentall Law of God in Scripture. For though there be a reſpect to the Church in the common definition of hereſie; yet this oppoſition to the Church doth not conſtitute hereſie, but rather ſchiſm. Hereſie hath in it more of the matter about which the error is. Schiſm hath more of the form in oppoſition to the Church, becauſe it is neither in things clearly commanded, ordinarily; nor in things neceſſary. And ſo his argument from a *manifeſt ſign* ſeems to be

be ſuch a ſign that he had no better; but beſides, the *minor*, which is couched wiſely in the Conſequent or Concluſion, is alſo in part falſe: for Hereticks have alſo pleaded the authority of the Church for themſelves, as hath been ſaid: and by his argument, this is a manifeſt ſign that they cannot clearly be condemned by the Church. And then again ſecondly, to the *minor*, he ſuppoſeth hereticks rationall men, becauſe they do wiſely decline, as he thinks, ſuch a Judge as would clearly condemn them. Well then, they may deſire to be judged by Scripture, not becauſe they cannot be clearly condemned thereby; but becauſe they know that that is the ſtandard whereby their opinions are to be authorized and made good, and becauſe they are to deal with thoſe who know there is no other way of ſolid reviction for the matter of hereſie, but by Scripture. Thirdly, the Adverſaries might have known, that as they have appealed to Scripture, ſo alſo to the Scripture they have been ſent by the Church: ſo St. *Auſtin* dealt with *Maximinus*: ſo St. *Athanaſius* ſaid the Nicene Fathers determined againſt the Arrians by Scripture, as before hath been ſaid. If therefore they, who in his opinion ſhould have judged them, judged them by authority of Scripture, then Scripture is the Law by which they are to be judged. And then the whole argument will be returned upon them, *mutatis mutandis*, thus, *All Offendors againſt the Law of God of their own accord would not chuſe ſuch a Judge by whom they know they ſhall clearly be condemned*; Therefore my Adverſaries who are Offendors againſt the Law of God in Scripture, of their own accord have

no

no mind to be judged by Scripture : and therefore they chuſe to be judged by the Church, which they interpret to be themſelves : thus, as Hereticks, of their own accord, would be their own Judges : ſo would our Adverſaries with all their hearts ; then they *agree with Hereticks*. And ſo it would poſe him to find any one Heretick ; as it would poſe me to find how my Adverſaries Church ſhould be condemned.

And as for the *falſe gloſſes and interpretations* whereby he thinks Hereticks may evade ; why ſhould we again ſay, that notwithſtanding they were dealt with by Law of Scripture, but alſo, ſo there are falſe gloſſes and interpretations of former Councils and later too ; elſe how could ſome definitions be ſo ſet down as ſhould pleaſe different parties ? And why ſo many differences ſtill ? But is this an argument for Theologie ? they may uſe *falſe gloſſes and interpretations*, therefore they are not to be judged by Scripture: as good an argument will ſtarve him, for fear of poiſon in his meat.

And as for our giving of *ſcope to theſe kind of gloſſes and Interpretations*, it is not ſo, *In maxima Libertate minima licentia*. Regular permiſſion to ſearch the Scriptures is no giving of ſcope to ſuch gloſſes and interpretations ; then, if ſo, in ſtead of the Beroeans commendation for ſearching the Scriptures, we muſt read condemnation. For if Miniſters may not give this libertie, the people ought not to take it.

Neither

Neither do I againſt any Council *firmely believe my own particular interpretation* to be true, but by conſequent : becauſe that which is ſo interpreted by me according to lawfull rules, I may judge to be true. And he may allow me a power of diſcourſe upon the propoſitions of Councils ; becauſe he, as others, may hold Councils to be fallible in their diſcourſe, but not in the Concluſion. And is not this very diſputable ? Can I be as much aſſured of it as that Jeſus is the Chriſt ? And may not I conſent to the antient Fathers againſt the Fathers of Trent ? And did not ſome Divines in the Trent Council complain that ſome determinations croſſed the mindes of the Antient Fathers ?

Trent Hiſt.

And now, if they will conſider that the Arrians *upheld an opinion*, which they know *condemned in a lawfull Generall Council*, namely, the firſt Nicene ; and alſo that the Arrians knew, and that others ought to know, that nothing, in point of faith, could authentickly be urged but out of Scripture, they may think they have ſatisfaction enough to this Paragraph.

And may what Chriſt and his Apoſtles have expreſſed, for the uſe of the Cup in the Holy Communion, be extruded ; and what the Trent Council determined for the omiſſion not doubted of ? Call they not this preſumption ? *Was ever any before theſe days ſo preſumptuous ?*

Here my Adverſary would maintain a ſuppoſition of his, that *they do only believe the Scriptures*, not we. *Anſ.*

Num. 20.

*Anſ.* This varies from the ſtate of the preſent queſtion: and therefore, when he goes from the queſtion, we need not follow him, for the *new doore* with us is this, whether the Scriptures do plainly contain all things neceſſary to ſalvation: yet, as he ſaid, *Non ſum piger, uſque ſequor.* His argument is this, *No body can believe this with Divine faith, who doth not ground his aſſent to this truth upon Divine revelation: but our Adverſaries doe not ground their aſſent to this truth upon Divine Revelation.*

*Anſ.* Some of our Divines have been charged with too much charitie: but we are now charged with a totall want of faith, and conſequently hope too. Yet we may hope to make his charge nought, and our faith good. but we need not ſay any more than what hath been ſaid, whereunto he hath ſaid as much as comes to little: yet now he diverts hither.

We muſt ſay therefore again, that this ſhould not be a queſtion betwixt us, how we believe the Scriptures to be the word of God: for this is ſuppoſed betwixt us as the ſubject of the queſtion. And we ſay, that the ſenſe of this argumentation is to as much purpoſe as if, when we are at *London* we muſt go back again, becauſe we did not go the new way. As to the Aſſumption then, we deny it. We do *ground our aſſent to this truth upon Divine Revelation*, Yea, moreover we return him his argument in terms, and therefore they have no Divine faith, ſo naturall it is for thoſe to ſpeak moſt who have a mind to cover their own defects. They cannot

*ground their assent to this truth upon Divine Revelation*, because they ground it upon the authority of the Church: for they must either have an immediate revelation that the Church is infallible; or else they must ground it upon the general sum of revealed truth; and that is the Scripture: for as for Tradition, that which is of a particular Church is of no weight, as to this business: and universall Tradition must go upon account of the Church: now then, if they say that they have a Revelation immediate, that the Church is infallible in proposing those books to be Canonical, they make that to be of use to them which they deny to us, who have as good reason to say, that we may as well have an immediate revelation that the Scripture is the word of God: but if they ground their faith upon some texts of Scripture which concern the Church, then they must believe the Scripture for it self. So then either they must come to us, or else indeed they have no Divine faith.

And therefore had he no cause to be offended with that I said, *that the Canonical books are worthy to be believed for themselves as we assent to prime principles in the habit of Intelligence.* To this he says in a parenthesis, *And so is the book of* Toby *and* Judith *as well as these.*

But doth he say, this γυμνῇ κεφαλῇ? and doth he not then find fault with the antient Church, who did not, as hath been shewn, give equall reverence to these, as to the books Canonical? If they be as worthy to be believed as the books Canonical, then they erred in not receiving them with

with equall belief : And if they erred, then our Adverſaries are loſt.

And now as for our aſſent to the Canonicall books in the manner of aſſent to prime principles, by the help of the Spirit of God ; they are not like to proſper in the abuſe of it. Firſt, it is to be noted, that we are not now to deal with one that denies the Scripture to be the word of God : for to an unbeliever hereof we ſhould uſe other arguments rationally to induce him to a good opinion hereof, but when we are demanded by a Chriſtian what is it that grounds our faith of Scripture, one would think we might ſay, that we are reſolved to a Divine faith hereof by the Spirit of God, diſpoſing our aſſent to them as of themſelves worthy to be believed, which is the reaſon of aſſent to prime principles. And therefore ſecondly, we do not ſay, that our aſſent to the Canonical books is by a naturall light, as our aſſent to prime principles ; but that our aſſent is made to them by way of Intelligence, through the Spirit : the light of the Spirit, as to ſhew us the Scripture to be worthie of belief for it ſelfe, is ſupernaturall : but when that comes, we believe it, as we do prime principles ; not by diſcourſe, but becauſe it is credible of it ſelf. Faith herein bears more proportion to intelligence than to ſcience : becauſe we do not in faith uſe a reaſon to the act, as we do in ſcience : And this is intimated in the common reading of that text of the Prophet, *Si non crediderint, non intelligent* : if they will not believe they ſhall not underſtand ; ſo then, ſince faith is a

ſupernaturall habit, as the School-men, the Spirit of God doth infuſe it into us, as being an habit infuſed, as they ſpeak: and this doth diſpoſe us to believe the Scripture to be the word of God, as by him indited, And one would think that it is a better ground to believe it to be the word of God, becauſe he ſaith ſo, than to believe it becauſe the Church ſaith ſo: and it is more about, becauſe I cannot believe it upon the account of the Church, but becauſe God gives teſtimony of the Church, and why cannot we then believe God, *teſte ſeipſo*. So all the aſſent we give to them is made upon the veracity of God, which is the center in which all lines of Scripture do meet and terminate.

Therefore might he have ſpared that which follows, *Have you brought all the infallibility of Chriſtian Religion unto this laſt ground to be trampled by the Socinians?*

*Anſ.* Firſt, I do not ſee what reaſon we have to lay the foundation of Religion ſo as to pleaſe the Socinian. One who maintained the Proteſtant cauſe was prejudiced by ſuſpition of being inclined to Socinianiſm: and I am now found fault with for not providing for their ſatisfaction in our principles. Well, but ſecondly, I do not finde that Socinians do abhor this tenure of Scripture. And thirdly, they, to be ſure, do trample upon the authority of their Church, as infallible. And therefore this is to be returned home to the Romaniſt.

And

And alſo upon the former grounds might he have omitted what follows from [*doe you expect*, unto *all that you believe*;] for although the object is to be believed for it ſelf, as a prime principle; yet is there not a naturall light for it: that comes ſupernaturally; and therefore faith is a ſupernatural habit. But if they would be accounted ſuch *rationall* men in the faith of Scripture, they do deſerve from the Socinian a negative reverence by a poſitive favour to them. But again, how far is that which I have ſaid different from the determination of *Ratisbon* in their fourth ſeſſion, *Scripturæ dicuntur perfectæ quoad perfectionem credibilitatis et exactiſſimæ veritatis*; The Scriptures are ſaid perfect, as in reſpect of the perfection of credibility, and moſt exact truth. And the perfection of credibility belongs to the firſt principles, which are indemonſtrable. And as thoſe principles have themſelves *immobiliter* unto Sciences, as *Aquinas*: ſo the Scriptures have themſelves unto Divinity. Here we muſt reſt. And if every one doth not believe them to be the word of God upon this account, this doth not derogate from the credibility of the object, thus we ſay, that the Scriptures are the infallible word of God, *is evident of its own ſelf, needing no further proof for the requiring an infallible aſſent* no more than the firſt principles, which are the object of intelligence.

And alſo therefore upon the premiſſes, that which concludes the number might have been forborn, *Indeed you have brought your whole Religion to as pitifull a caſe as your Adverſaries could wiſh it.*

Theſe

These braving words do not hurt a ſolid cauſe, they are to be returned to the place from whence they came, who hath brought Religion to ſo *pitifull a* caſe as the Pontifician, who muſt have religion made accomodable to their pride and covetuouſneſs? No caſe of Religion ſo pitifull as uncertainty: no ſuch uncertainty of Religion as with them. For if they ground their Religion upon the determination of Councils, wherein onely Biſhops have their vote, and the Biſhop of *Rome* his confirmation thereof; no man can, according to their principles, be certain whether there be a true Pope, or true Biſhop; as hath been ſaid. Moreover, we can make uſe of intrinſecall arguments for the truth of Scripture to be the word of God, as well as they. We can make uſe of extrinſecall arguments better; for we make uſe of the authority of the whole Church, and do give it, in this point, as much reverence as is due thereunto. But therefore, till that which is here ſaid for the ſetling of our faith, be diſproved; and alſo till it be proved, that we do not make uſe of theſe arguments towards our faith of Scripture, becauſe we do not pitch our finall reſolution in them, our ground of faith and of Religion is as good and ſound as theirs; yea, in reſpect of our own ſubjective faith, more. Yea, the Romaniſt might know, that he hath been told, that *Eſtius* doth differ from them upon this point? and ſays, that it is not neceſſary to faith to be begotten by the propoſall of the Church. in the third *B.* of ſenten. 23 *diſt.* Yea, alſo *Stapleton* in his Triplication againſt *Whitaker* ſaith, p. 103. *Ego igitur quicquid in hac cauſa Spiritui ſancto tribuendum eſt, pleniſſime aſſignavi,*

*navi, &c.* "I have moſt fully aſſigned what is "to be attributed to the Holy Ghoſt in this cauſe, "aſſerting theſe two things; both that by faith "infuſed alone, or by the teſtimony of the Ho-"ly Spirit alone, all faith may be begotten, when "itpleaſeth the Spirit of God to teach any ex-"traordinarily immediately; and alſo, although "ordinarily a thing is delivered by the teſtimo-"ny and authority of the Church, yet no faith "doth efficaciouſly follow, without the gift of "faith infuſed by God, or without the inter-"nall teſtimony of the Spirit of God.

And again the ſame in the next page, to the ſame purpoſe, to clear himſelf of the ſuſpition of giving no more to the Holy Ghoſt in this point than thoſe who put the laſt reaſon of believing in the teſtimony of the Church, he ſays diſertly, "*Ego enim, &c.* For I have denied and do de-"ny, that the laſt reaſon of believing is to be "put in the teſtimony of the Church; not one-"ly upon that head, that that laſt propoſition "or reſolution [I believe the Church to be gover-"ned by the Holy Ghoſt.] is not had without "the inward gift of faith, or that he who belie-"veth this, believeth this by a gift of faith and "not by humane faith or acquiſit; but eſpeci-"ally upon that head, that without any teſtifica-"tion of the Church or notice of the Church or "of the knowledge of that propoſition [That the "Church is governed by the Spirit of God] by "the onely Magiſterie of the Spirit of God, one "may believe all that is to be believed, as the "Prophets and Apoſtles being taught by the Spi-"rit of God alone, did believe many things, for

"for from hence it follows invincibly againſt "*Durandus* and others, ſince there can be but "one formall reaſon of our faith, and ſome be-"lieve without the teſtimony of the Church, "but none can believe without the teſtimony of "the Spirit, that the proper and formall reaſon "of faith is not the voice of the Church, but "muſt be the teſtimony, the Doctrine, the "Magiſtery of the Spirit of God. So he. And therefore there is leſſe between *Stapleton* and me; than betwixt my Adverſary and me. When all is done therefore, we muſt come to this of the Father, *Cathedram habet in cœlis qui corda docet in terris*: He hath his Chair in Heaven that teacheth hearts on earth; and with the heart man believeth unto ſalvation. *Rom* 10. 10.

Num. 21. Therefore in the following number he needed not to take notice of my differing from others of our own Church in this point: let them agree with their own men. Let *Bannes* and *Stapleton* agree with *Durand.* or if they cannot be reconciled, let them never hereafter make any difference amongſt our ſelves a prejudice to the cauſe. It is then no more reproach to me to differ from others, than for ſome of them.

As for the three then, whom he ſays, I differ from, Mr. *Chillingworth*, Dr. *Cowell*, and Mr. *Hooker*; if they do not agree it, it is no infallible argument againſt me even in the opinion of thoſe three. But alſo, as to the firſt, I ſay, and my Adverſaries might have known, that he held not faith in the high notion of a

Divine

Divine assent, as they do: But that a morall assurance was sufficient to it, and sufficiently influxive into necessary practice. And therefore having this opinion of faith, he conceived no such need of an infallible ground hereof, but took therefore a common principle for his motive hereof, namely, universal tradition. Secondly, if he takes not his grounds from my Adversaries, what do they get by him? For in his sixty sixth page, he says, that it is *altogether as* αὐτόπιστον *to* him *that the Gospell of St.* Mathew *is the word of God, as that all that* the Roman *Church says is true.* Yea, moreover the same p. 135. doth fairly shew that *the Spirit of God* may give assurance hereof, which he says indeed, is not rationall and discursive, but supernaturall and infused. An assurance it may be to himself, but not to any other: and again, p. 211. that *the Doctrine* it self is very fit and worthy to be thought to come from God, *Nec vox hominem sonat.* And is not then in his opinion the Scripture αὐτόπιστον; If then he had raised faith to that height of a Divine assent, as my Adversaries do, it is very like he would have thought better of this assurance by the Spirit to be more ordinary; since universal tradition, if it hath any weight, must rest in Scripture, as it is the tradition of the universal Church, (which also he contradistinguisheth not onely to the Roman Church for place, but to the present universall Church for time) becaus we cannot prove the Church but by Scripture.

And as for the other two whose judgements he opposeth to my opinion, I think they may re-

ceive convenient ſatisfaction by what is ſaid to the former: that they did not deny this aſſurance by the Spirit of God, but that it is not argumentative to others. And therefore as to the queſtion about the ſufficiency of Scripture, Mr. *Hooker* ſays, that this is to be ſuppoſed, that the Scriptures are the word of God. And notwithſtanding he thinks this is not to be proved by it ſelf, yet in his firſt book, 34. p. he ſpeaks enough, in that he ſays, the Scriptures do ſufficiently direct us to ſalvation. And he quotes for it *Sotus* in the margent. And if it ſufficiently directs us to ſalvation, then muſt it be ſufficiently clear of it ſelf that it is the word of God: for otherwiſe, the principal point unto ſalvation muſt be known otherwiſe. And if they think to argue well, that we muſt have all faith from the authority of the Church, becauſe we have the faith of the Scriptures from the Authority of the Church, we may as well conclude, that ſince we have ſufficient direction to ſalvation from the Scripture, we are alſo ſufficiently directed to this main point of faith from the Scripture, that the Scripture is the word of God. Yea more; the Scripture doth give better evidence of it ſelf to be the word of God, than the Church can give teſtimony, of it ſelf, to be infallible: becauſe the Church as ſuch, in religion, is a *non ens* without Scripture in the ſubſtance of it. But to make an end of this exception againſt me in varying from others; this is the common Proteſtant principle; or elſe *Stapleton* was decieved, who makes account that every one of us *ad unum* do hold the Scripture to be known *per ſe et ſua quadam luce propria*. Therefore if the queſtion be how we are

*In Analſiy principionem.*

pri-

privately assured ultimately that the Scripture is the word of God, we say, with *Stapleton*, that we are assured hereof by the testimony of the Spirit: if the question be how we prove it to others to be the word of God, we can, for extrinsecall proof, make use with Mr. *Chillingworth* of universal tradition.

His exception then against our private assurance of the Scripture to be the word of God, in his following words, comes to nothing: for we need not, from what we have said, say, that the assent of faith is evident, as to an object of sense: but yet the assent may be more firm and certain. The formall object of faith is inevident: yet may we more fastly hold to what we believe than to what we see, because what we see *depends upon our fallible sense*: but what we believe, hath an *infallible ground*, namely, the word of God, that this is his word. For this ultimately must settle our personall faith: or else we have no faith, of proper name which is infallibly grounded: All believe that what God says is true: but if to the question, whether God says this, God cannot bring his own testimony, there can be no authentick ground of Religion *in subjecto*. And those therefore who would not have died to bear witness to a thing of sense, have died to bear testimony to the Christian Religion: and also have died for it, assuredly, *ex vi habitus*, by the power of the habit of faith, not *ex vi traditionis*, by the credibility of the Church.

And as to that, which he takes notice of, that I acknowledge a *greater necessity of such a Church*

*to declare by infallible authority which books be the true word of God, which not, than to declare any other point*: I anſwer, that it is not very ingenuouſly taken here by him, what I ſaid; for I ſpake by way of ſuppoſition, that it would not follow, if the Church were infallible as to propoſe, or tax and conſign Canonical books, (as *Stapleton* ſpeaks) yet that we had need of the Church infallibly to propoſe every other point of faith. He, it ſeems, took poſitively, what was ſpoken upon ſuppoſition. Every thing which is given in diſcourſe is not granted to him: but this he refers to num. 43.

For the ending then of this Paragraph, and ſufficiently for the Controverſie, upon the whole matter, it remains, that the Scripture muſt be credible for it ſelf, or elſe the Church. Not the Church, that muſt be known by the Scriptures, as before, therefore thoſe texts by which the Church is proved in the truth and infallibility, muſt be worthy to be believed for themſelves, or not: if ſo, then why not other parts of Scripture; and ſo we have our purpoſe? if not, then are we in a circle; and muſt beg the queſtion and never be ſatisfied.

Num. 22. Here another argument is drawn againſt me from the effect negatively; which, in the kind of it, doth not conclude, *A non eſſe ad non poſſe non valet*. And we may as well argue, that ſome have this way attained faith; therefore this is the way: however, the poſſibility proceeds from the effect to [illegible], but it doth not proceed againſt a poſſibility from the deniall of it to ſome. Because

cauſe *Pighius* and *Hermannus* have not found aſſurance this way, therefore this is not the way for finall aſſurance, is inconſequent. Secondly, the cauſe of non-aſſurance thus, doth not ariſe from the defect in Scripture, (which *Stapleton* ſays, and ſome others is true and holy and authentick) but God doth not give by his Spirit faith to all. All men have not faith; as the Apoſtle, as commonly we expound it, and though they are ſaid to believe in the ſenſe of the Church becauſe they profeſſe the Chriſtian Religion: yet by an internall act of faith many not. Thirdly, neither are we bound to maintain this propoſition of theirs, *Facienti quod in ſe eſt datur gratia ex congruo*; and therefore, if upon the uſe of means, they have not this Divine faith infuſed, it is no prejudice to our cauſe: for not onely gifts are *gratiæ gratis datæ*, but alſo the *gratiæ gratum facientes* are alſo freely given: and therefore is their diſtinction, by the way, faultie. And therefore, if there be *many millions* (which is yet more than he could know) *who can truly and ſincerely proteſt before God, and take it upon their ſalvation, that they are wholly unable by the reading theſe books to come to an infallible aſſurance that this is Gods word*; This inferrs nothing of moment againſt us, becauſe, although we have not ordinarily the effect without the means, yet becauſe we uſe the meanes therefore neceſſarily we ſhall have the effect, doth not follow, if the graces of God be free. Yea, fourthly, thoſe millions he means are of their Church, we may ſuppoſe: and they, we may think, are inſtructed to find no reſolution but in their own way, by the propoſall of the Church:

Church : So that as St. *Paul* ſays, *Rom.* 10. 3. "of the Jews, that they going about to eſtabliſh "their own righteouſneſs, have not ſubmitted "themſelves to the righteouſneſs of God : ſo alſo may we ſay of theſe, that they going about to eſtabliſh the authority of the Church in this point, have not ſubmitted themſelves to the authority of God. Yea, fifthly and laſtly, (to be even with him in kind) it is ſaid in *Euſebius*, that for ſome time in the Church, ſome books were doubted of : now let me aſk how came the Chriſtians afterwards to be aſſured of thoſe books to be alſo Canonicall ? Not by the former Church ; for they doubted thereof : not by the latter Church ; that was impoſſible. How then came the Chriſtians firſt to be perſwaded of thoſe books to be alſo authentick ? If it be ſaid by the preſent Church ; we ſuppoſe a time before the Church then was thereof aſſured. Yea, if it be ſaid, that private Chriſtians were therein reſolved by a Council, we ſay that ſome were aſſured of books, before doubted of, before there was any General Council : Yea, how came thoſe of the Council (upon the ſuppoſition) to be ſo determined of them ? It will be ſaid by them, that they were aſſured by the Spirit of God ; then, as *Stapleton's* argument is, ſince there is one formal reaſon of faith, the laſt reſolution muſt be by the Spirit.

Num. 24. In the twenty fourth number he argues againſt me thus, that if my opinion were *true, then let but an Heathen or Turk or Jew read the Goſpell, he muſt by reading of it ſee it as clearly to be Gods word, as he might ſee the Sun by his light.*

*Anſ.*

*Anſ.* If they muſt be anſwered *toties quoties*, we ſay, they ſuppoſe that which is not to be ſuppoſed, that we ſay the Scripture may be ſeen by its own light naturally. We ſay not ſo. Supernaturall objects are not ſeen by natural faculty: for then what needed the teſtimony of their Church? The object is fair; were the faculty fit. The Spirit of God doth not relate to the object directly, but to the faculty enlightning it. Ὡς γὰρ τὰ τῶν νυκτερίδων ὄμματα πρὸς τὸ φῶς ἔχει οὕτω καὶ ἡμῶν ὁ νοῦς πρὸς τὰ ἐν τῇ, as *Ariſtotle* in his Metaphyſicks: and much more therefore is our minde unable to look up upon that which is not only removed from ſenſe, but alſo from reaſon: therefore is the apprehenſive power raiſed by the Spirit of God to make a proportion betwixt the faculty and the object: and the difficulty of apprehenſion is more from the weakneſſe of the faculty than the ſublimity of the object: therefore if an Heathen or Turk or Jew were by the Spirit of God inlightned, he would by reading of the Scripture have ſuch an eye as might diſcern the Scriptures to be the word of God. And alſo neither can any one by reading of the determinations of Councils ſee that they are the word of God. Hath God provided better for their clear converſion by the voice of the Church than by his written word? Doth the Turk and Jew run to the Church of *Rome* as naturally as the Lamb to the dam? Doth the Jew think he hath reaſon to recieve the Scripture from the Roman, as to the old Teſtament? Or doth he not think that the Roman ſhould take the Bible from him? and therefore, in courſe, the Jew is ſaid to offer it the Pope, as he goes to his Palace.

*If this were true, it is impoſſible thouſands ſhould not be yearly converted by this means.*

*Anſ.* No, if the Roman could help it: for he would not ſuffer them to have the common uſe of the Bible, yea alſo may we ſay the ſame, if they could not but believe by the knowledge of the Church at firſt ſight. Yea, ſurely the reaſon why ſo few of them doe believe, is not becauſe they are not diſpoſed to believe by reading of the Scripture, but becauſe they are not diſpoſed to read them.

This effect indeed he vaunts is to be performed *by the Preachers of the Church*: who *have found the concurrence of Gods grace to the converſion of millions.*

*Anſ.* It is well that they have ſo good reaſon to magnifie preaching: and yet this action is not by their great ones ſo highly eſteemed; and this practice I think they took from their Adverſaries, who had the firſt fruits of this office: and therefore if it be ſo; the argument is available as well to them. But ſecondly, the converſion was not, it ſeems, *ex vi miniſterii*; but by the *concurrence of Gods grace*: and ſurely the concurrence of Gods grace is ſufficient to converſion by reading. But thirdly, if the Preachers of their Church (as *Xavier*) with the concurrence of Gods grace did convert millions, then I hope infallibility may be even in private Doctors; or elſe we have no need of infallibility in order to converſion.

But

But he ſuppoſeth that *reading of the Scriptures alone did never find the concurrence of Gods grace to convert any ſingle man (that we could hear of.)*

*Anſ.* More may be done than they know: and more may they ſay of their Preachers than was done. Secondly, were their Preachers Preachers of the Church *objective*? If ſo, then they had other denominations than did become them who had a mind to follow the Apoſtles, who rather commended Chriſt to the Church. than the Church to Chriſtians. Yea; if St. *Paul*, 2 *Cor.* 4, 5. ſays, "We preach not our ſelves, "but Jeſus Chriſt the Lord, and our ſelves your "ſervants for Jeſus ſake; how could they preach themſelves or the Roman Doctors to be the Maſters of their faith, and the Roman Church not onely to be the Mother, but Miſtriſſe of the Chriſtian world? Thirdly, if any did believe by them, they did not believe for them, and therefore was not their authority the ground of their faith: nay, not the authority of the Roman Church; for that can have no greater authority than St. *Paul* had: and what ſaid he of himſelf, 1 Ep. *Cor.* 3.5. For what is *Paul*, and what is *Apollos*, but Miniſters by whom ye believed; *&c.* And fourthly, is not reading of the word an ordinance of God? and therefore was the Law read in the Synagogues every Sabbath day, and is there any ordinance of God with which he doth not at all concur? though he is not bound to it: yet he doth it gratiouſly. Yea, fiftly, was not *Junius* converted to the Chriſtian faith by reading of the firſt Chapter of

St. *John*, *with the concurrence of God's grace?*

N. 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29. In all these he prosecutes the same discourse, against the clearnesse of the Scripture to be the word of God by its own light. And all the arguments therein do, in effect, hang upon one string; which is a supposition, that we should hold this principle, of the Scripture's being the word of God, to be as clearly assented to by a natural faculty, as a principle of Science. Only in the 29. number he doth dispute against the help of the Spirit to see the Scripture to be credible for it self.

That supposition we have already taken away: and so the string being broken; all those arguments must fall, yet what in them is new and of moment I shall touch and remove.

As to the want of suffrages from the Antients for my opinion in this point, which he chargeth it with in his twenty fourth Par. I say no more than that I have said more than he had any mind to make any answer to; the reason whereof I have given before.

And as to his imagination, that if the Fathers had perswaded the Heathens to believe the Scripture by its own light, they would have *scoffed at them*, we have answered before, that we use not such an argument to perswade others: but this we have for our private assurance, as we cannot assent to Christian Doctrine but by the Spirit (for *no man can say Jesus is the Lord but by the Spirit*;) so no man can give a Divine assent to the books of

of Scriptnre, but by the Spirit, as *Stapleton* hath affirmed: therefore though we cannot argue to others the reception of theſe books as Canonical by that inward teſtimony of the Spirit, which we cannot make known to others infallibly; yet ſurely we may be able to prove to the Pontificians, at leaſt, that there is ſuch a teſtimony of the Spirit of God *in theſi*: they will not argue from the deniall of it *in Hypotheſi* to private Chriſtians, to the deniall of it *in univerſali*: for they ſay that the Church which is to commend theſe books to private men (if they think they are to be commended to them) is aſſured, that they are books Divine and Canonical, by the teſtimony of the Spirit: ſo that, upon the point, we agree for the kind of aſſurance, and they come to us for the laſt aſſurance: onely they will have us to have this aſſurance mediately, by the Church. So the whole *ratio* and account of a Papiſt is, δι' ὑπὸ ἐκκλ, delivered by *Stapleton*, *Dei verbum per os Eccleſiæ intelligimus*; both the faith of the Scripture, and faith out of the Scripture we muſt have it from the Church. And yet the Church Repreſentative muſt have it ſeverally from the Spirit immediately too: and ſo there is leſſe difference. And yet there was no Council or Pope ſurely for the firſt three hundred years; in which time notwithſtanding men did believe the Scriptures to be the word of God; and then no difference betwixt them and us in the perſwaſion of Canonical Scripture. Secondly, *Dato non conceſſo*, that there had been nothing ſaid by the Fathers touching this point (which yet, as before, is not ſo) yet cannot we argue from them negatively as we doe

from Scripture; becauſe even the chief of their Doctors will ſay, that the Scripture is a rule of faith, and the principal one too, ſome: but ſo is not the conſent of the Fathers with the Papiſts *in communi*, (for they will differ from them as they did in the Trent Council) and ſpecially with my Adverſary who hath, before, contradiſtinguiſhed the Fathers to the authority of the Church. So then, as we cannot ſolidly reaſon from their uſe of arguing from the Church, that there is no better aſſurance abſolutely; ſo neither could we from the ſilence of the teſtimony of the Spirit, argue, that we muſt only depend upon the Church. But thirdly, he might have obſerved in St. *Auſtin* the reaſon why they urged the authority of the Church for the confirmation of Scripture, in *lib. de utilitate credendi cap.* 5. *Scripturæ populariter accuſari poſſunt, non poſſunt populariter defendi*, namely, otherwiſe than by the Church: yet he alſo doth ſuffragate for us in his book againſt the Epiſtle of the *Manich. Non jam hominibus ſed ipſo Deo intrinſecus mentem noſtram firmante atque illuminante*; not men now, but God himſelf confirming and inlightning our mind within. And for triumph, *Caniſius* and *Hoſius* (beſides *Stapleton*) of the Romaniſts are brought in with their teſtimonies to the ſame purpoſe, that we have a greater teſtimony of the Scriptures than the Church, namely, that of the Spirit of God.

Dr. *Whit. De Eccleſ.* p. 254.

As for that which follows, *Really I think if the Doctors of the Primitive Church had told the Heathens, &c.* to the end of the Paragraph, how little doth it weigh with us. *Really* we may think

think that they think any thing will ſerve to make up weight. We can uſe, to ſuch, the ſame argument with the Fathers without any derogation to our cauſe. And ſecondly, they did not plead the Church upon the Roman account: and therefore, if they will have all, they have no ſhare. But to ſerve them in kind: Did the Doctors of the primitive Church tell the Heathens of our ordinary Paſtor, which ſhould be the Plenipotentiarie of the whole Church? Did they tell them of Tranſubſtantiation? And had they told them that theſe things were as credible by the authority of the Church as by *a light as evident as the Sun, the Heathens* ſurely *would have ſcoffed at them for ſaying* them *to be ſo viſible.* And again he argues from the viſibility to the actuall ſight, not conſidering what is requiſit in the ſubject, namely, facultie and will.

This number is ἐν λόγῳ ἐν δεκάδι· the argument is this, there are as many *raies obſervable in the book of Toby or Judith,* as in ſo many chapters of the book of *Numbers.* Num. 25.

*Anſ.* Would any one have expected ſo bold an aſſertion? But then why were theſe accounted amongſt the reſt Deuterocanonical? why were they not accounted by *Jerom,* by *Euſebius,* by *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem* (as before) equal to the books Canonical, as to confirmation of faith? Why rejected by ſo many learned men, as Doctor *White* in his Defence of the true way doth cite, p. 32? Well. And how came the firſt Chriſtian to diſtinguiſh them? Not by the authority of the Church: then by ſome difference in the books by the Divine illumination. For ſecondly, the Church hath

hath not, as to the Canonicallneſſe of books, *vim operativam*, but *vim declarativam*, as at moſt, even according to their greateſt Doctors: and therefore this they do not αὐτοκρατορικῶς, but *ex officio*: then either they were not declared in the primitive times, or were declared by ſome diſcrimination from the books: if they were not declared, there is no neceſſity now neither that they ſhould be declared; if they were declared upon reaſon of the difference, then there are not ſuch *raies* in the books Apocryphall. Thirdly, if theſe books were allways to be received as Canonicall, then the Church in the Primitive times erred in not receiving them. If they be not to be received as Canonicall, as they were not received ſo, then the Roman Church erreth in the receiving them for ſuch. And this *Dilemma* is deſtructive of their infallibility.

Num. 26. A ſixth argument is drawn from a poſſibility of ſome omiſſion of ſome words in Scripture, *as the little word* [*not*,] to an impoſſibility of my diſcerning *this omiſſion only by the reading of Scripture.*

*Anſ.* The Scripture is either corrupted or not. If the former, how can we truſt the Church of *Rome*, which pretends it ſelf the Keeper: if not, the argument is void, and *Bellarmin* holds the latter. Secondly; *Conditio impoſſibilis facit negativam*: if it were falſe it could not be the word of God: therefore ſince we both acknowledge it to be the word of God, we cannot, *ut ſic*, ſuppoſe ſuch an omiſſion. Thirdly, if there were a [not] left out, how ſhould the Church have

have power to put it in? For then the Church would have power to contradict the old reading, and ſo to make Scripture: if the Church had not power, then it would be as uncertain as we. Fourthly, if there were a [not] left out in things ſubſtantiall and neceſſary, it would likely make a contradiction to other texts where the ſame matter is delivered (for it would be very hard to find ony point neceſſary to be one of thoſe which are ἀπλᾶ λεγόμενα) now ſince we both conclude no Contradiction in Scripture (for then it would not be true and infallible) we do ἐκ τῆς παραλειψέως conclude that there is no ſuch *omiſſion*. Fifthly, if we may he perſwaded by the Spirit of God, that the Scripture is the word of God, then conſequently we are aſſured that there is *not* ſuch an *omiſſion*: but *verum prius, ergo poſterius*.

Here we have a ſeventh argument, *Luther* who *had the Spirit as well as* I, *if not in a larger meaſure, contradicts* me in the Canonicallneſſe of *the Epiſtle of St. James and in ths book of the Revelation*; therefore this ground of believing Canonicall books is fallible: ſince in a Contradiction one part muſt be falſe. And thus he thought to pay me in kind for my diſputing the error of Councils by a Contradiction; which, he ſays, *If you could prove, you ſhould prove, that Councilsare fallible.* Num. 27.

*Anſ.* As for the Metaphyſicall Law in Contradictions, that one part muſt be *falſe*, if we hold any thing certainly true, we differ not.

And

And concerning the proof of Councils to be fallible by ones contradicting another, it comes in here but collaterally; this is not *ſedes materiæ*: and therefore as he brings it in we may paſſe it with a light foot.

In point of fact they will confeſſe they may as well contradict one another, as err.: and therefore we will not now inſiſt upon the contradiction of the Council of *Chalcedon* and the ſecond of *Nice* about the Epiſtle of *Ibas*. But did not the Council of *Francford* contradict the ſecond Council of *Nice* in point of worſhip of Images? But alſo to give them *exemplum utile*; the Council of *Laodicea* rejected the Apocryphal books, as not Canonical: the Council of Trent receives them for ſuch, Seſ. 4. So one contradicts another. And if it be ſaid that the Council of *Laodicea* was not Generall; we anſwer, that it was as Generall as the Council of *Carthage*, which he urgeth below for he book of *Maccabees*: for this was but provinciall, by *Carranza's* confeſſion. But then ſecondly, we ſay, though it was but provinciall, yet was it eſtabliſhed by the ſixth Generall Council, as *Carranza* alſo confeſſeth; and then conſequently, the ſixth Generall Council and the Council of Trent do contradict.

And now as to the contradiction betwixt *Luther* and me upon the caſe, I ſay firſt, that the argument is not yet valid to his purpoſe; the objects have themſelves equally to all: but all have themſelves not equally to objects: and yet, though *Luther* had a greater *meaſure* of the Spirit

Spirit than I, it doth not follow nevertheleſſe, that this book could not be ſeen to be Divine by the Divine illumination; no more than it doth follow, that becauſe St. *Peter* had a greater meaſure of the grace of God's Spirit, he could not deny his Maſter. As a larger meaſure of grace doth not exclude all poſſibility of ſin; ſo neither doth a larger meaſure of the Spirit exclude all poſſibility of error. Secondly, was not the Church of Chriſt as quick-ſighted, by the help of the Spirit, before the Council of *Carthage*, as then? And yet it ſeems by my Adverſary, that the Church did not clearly propoſe the book of *Maccabees* to be Canonicall before that time: and therefore non-acknowledgement in ſome doth not prove againſt poſſibility of certain knowledge. And thus, if *Luther's* exceptions againſt thoſe books were always continued in the height of termes (which yet is denied) he gaines nothing againſt us, ſince alſo, Thirdly, we return the Adverſary his own argument, if the determinations of the Church be ſo clear, how doe they contradict one another?

Next follows the inſtance he puts of thoſe two prime Doctors of the Church, St. *Jerom* and St. *Auſtin*, about the book of *Maccabees*. St. *Auſtin*, as he would have us think, held it for Canonicall: St. *Jerom* not. So then, here is Father againſt Father: and therefore conſent of Fathers in all points is ſcarce a poſſible argument. But the cauſe, he ſays, of this difference was not our ground, (this we have ſpoken to) but becauſe it was not clearly pro-

poſed in St. *Jerom's* time by the Church, *But the third Council of* Carthage *(in which St* Auſtin *was preſent) declared theſe books to be God's word, and ſo St.* Auſtin *held theſe books infallibly to be God's word, &c.*

*Anſ.* Not to paſſe it, that St. *Auſtin* might be more likely to ſwallow the account of theſe books, becauſe he had not ſkill in the Hebrew Canon, as the Greek he learned late. And not to paſſe it, that my Adverſary names not the place where St. *Auſtin* held theſe books to be God's word, and infallibly too: it may be he held them ſo as the book of Wiſedom, of which before: but my Adverſary ſpeaks one word here ingenuouſly, that the third Council of *Carthage* did but *declare*: well, and the Council of *Laodicea* did before *declare* the contrary. This was before St. *Jerom*'s time, being celebrated in the year 364. as *Carranza* reckons: and the reaſon then, why St. *Jerom* refuſed that book, was not becauſe he had *not ſeen this Council of Carthage*, as my Adverſary ſays, but becauſe he had read the Canons of the Council of *Laodicea*: for this was of equall authority to that of *Carthage*; being both provinciall; and both confirmed by the ſixth Generall Council, as the former Author obſerves: and if ſo, then, by the way, the ſame Generall Council was guilty of a Contradiction, as eſtabliſhing the Canons of thoſe Councils, which in this point about the books of the *Maccabees*, are repugnant one to other. Again, if the authority of the Council of *Carthage* did bind St. *Auſtin* (who ſubſcribed it) as to the acknowledgement of theſe books for Canonicall; then the

the twenty ſixth Canon of the ſame Council doth equally bind, "That the Biſhop of the firſt ſea "ſhould not be called the Prince of the Prieſts, "or the ſupreme Prieſt, or any ſuch thing, but "onely the Biſhop of the firſt ſea. Therefore let the Roman either not urge this Council againſt us, or receive it againſt himſelf. Nay, laſtly, we can better anſwer the Canon againſt us than *Carranza* anſwers the Canon againſt *Rome's* Supremacy. For, the reaſon which my Adverſary gives out of the Canon for reception of thoſe books, doth not oblige to receive them equally to Canonical books, namely, *becauſe we have received from our Fathers, that they were read in the Church.* The ſtrength of this reaſoning is reſolved into this propoſition, Whatſoever is read in the Church is to be taken for Canonical: and this propoſition is falſe by the practice of the Church of *England*, by St. *Jerom's* diſtinction: yea, alſo by the Canon it ſelf, for it ſayes, *Liceat etiam legi paſſiones Martyrum, cum anniverſarii dies eorum celebrantur*: It may be lawfull alſo to read the paſſions of the Martyrs, when their anniverſary days are celebrated. And alſo if that reaſon did bind the Fathers in the Council of *Carthage* to eſtabliſh them as Canonical, why did it not as well bind St. *Jerom* in whoſe time the books alſo were read, if they were univerſally read? And if the Church of God was ſufficiently inſtructed in point of faith without them till St. *Auſtin's* time (which was above four hundred years after Chriſt, as *Bellarmin* confeſſeth) why may not the Church be well enough without them ſtill? For either there muſt be nothing in them materiall or

expoſitionall, which is ſimply neceſſary for Gods Church: or elſe the Church of God for the pureſt and beſt times muſt be unprovided thereof, as Canonically to ground faith. If they confeſſe the former, we have what we would: if the latter, beſides other conſequences, they deſtroy the rule of faith to Councils themſelves; or as ſome now will ſay, by ſucceſſion of tradition. Therefore by this inſtance he gets nothing, it is neither *proof* nor *diſproof*.

Num. 28. Here he triumphs before the victory, he doth here put a new face upon an old argument. *If you ſay that we muſt have a ſpeciall Spirit (that is new eyes) to ſee it, then you who have this Spirit are all Prophets, diſcovering, by private Revelation made to your ſelves, that which all mankind beſides could not and cannot diſcover.*

This argument prophylactical preſerves them little: A ſpeciall Spirit is conſiderable two ways; either in *ordine ad ſubjectum*, or *in ordine ad objectum*: it may be ſpeciall in the firſt ſenſe; and not in the latter: Now it is the ſpeciall Spirit in the latter ſenſe which makes the Prophet; when ſome new thing is revealed: thus we deny any ſpeciall Spirit; which rather belongs to them who will not have all things for neceſſary faith and manners revealed in Scripture, that ſo they may find in the Church, by tradition, the points of their Religion which they cannot find in Scripture; as is noted. But alſo the ſpeciall faith in the firſt ſenſe may be ſubdiſtinguiſhed; it is conſiderable either as oppo-

oppoſitly to thoſe who have not faith; or reſpectively to thoſe who have faith: in the firſt way, we ſay it is ſpeciall; for all men have not faith, as the Apoſtle ſpeaks. 2 *Theſ.* 3. 2. but if it be taken reſpectively to thoſe who have faith, we ſay it is not ſpeciall; but common: for there is no true dogmaticall faith but ſuch; as *Stapleton* and their Schoolmen confeſſe. Yea, this argument may be returned to them too, if they ſay they are inlightned by the Spirit to ſee all truth infallibly to be delivered by the Church, they have the *new eyes*; and they *are all Prophets, diſcerning by private revelation made to* them *ſelves that which all mankind beſides could not* diſcover. So then the other old argument, which here he incruſtates, that if the evidence of Scripture to be the word of God were ſuch as of a prime principle, as this [*It is impoſſible that any thing ſhould be and not be in the ſelf ſame circumſtances*] then all ſhould aſſent to it, as they do to this principle, is again ſlighted: for firſt, every one hath not that ſupernaturall light or eye to ſee the truth of that firſt principle, that the Scripture is the word of God; which we have ſaid before: but then ſecondly, the prime principle in Metaphyſicks are not ſo clear as to exclude all neceſſity of means of knowledge of them, though they do naturally perſwade aſſent: ſo there are means of knowing the Scripture, which do not prejudice their autopiſty through the Spirit of God: and therefore there may be a failing of belief. Yea, thirdly, the Spirit bloweth where it liſteth, *John* 3. 8. Yea, fourthly, many truths are aſſented to κατὰ τὸν ἴδιον λόγον, as he ſaid, which are

not

not prophorically acknowledged. And yet ſome of their own men have confeſſed this truth, being overcome by the ſoveraignty of it. Fifthly, it is retorted, if the authority of the Church were the prime principle for the evidence of faith, then all would aſſent to it: but all doe not aſſent to it: therefore by his own argument, the Church's authority is not the prime principle.

But the aſſiſtance of the Spirit he then pleads *a fortiori* for the Church, *the Church having far more proof of her aſſiſtance than every private Proteſtant.*

*Anſ.* Firſt, we have no to need be put upon the compare with the Church. If the Church have infallible aſſiſtance herein: yet private Chriſtians may have it too; and that would be ſufficient for us in this point. But ſecondly, the Church is no otherwiſe infallibly certain hereof than we: for this is aſſured to every one that votes it in the Council, the ſame way; if indeed they doe give their ſuffrage upon a ground infallible. Thirdly, the private Chriſtian is aſſured hereof by the Spirit for himſelf: therefore the Council needs not be infallible herein as to teach it, becauſe we are thus *taught of God.* If the compare were thus, if the private Chriſtian were thus aſſiſted to teach others, much more the Council, this would be ſomewhat like: but the private Chriſtian doth not undertake this: and yet doth it not follow that this infallibility doth attend the Council which doth undertake to teach others: becauſe there

is

is uſe of its teaching without infallibility: and no need of its teaching infallibly this point, which we are infallibly perſwaded of by the Spirit of God. And fourthly, we deny that there is any *points of as much conſequence*, wherein the Church ſhould be aſſiſted with infallibility, as this, that the Scripture is the word of God: becauſe, if we be aſſured of this, we need not depend upon any infallibility in the Church for other points, ſince all things neceſſary are with ſufficient plainneſſe ſet down in the Scripture. Fifthly, as before, the Chriſtians were aſſured hereof before Pope or Council, in which he placeth the authority infallible of the Church. And again, if the univerſall Church had this priviledge they ſpeak of, they are to prove themſelves to be firſt a true part: and then alſo, that the part hath the property of the whole: and when they have done theſe, we can ſay as much, yea, more for our own Church. And laſtly, they are yet to ſhew their clearer *proofs of aſſiſtance* to the Church, than a private Chriſtian hath for the *hardeſt of all points*: namely, that the Scripture is the word of God: which indeed, if it be compared with the points of Controverſie in Divinity, is not the hardeſt point: and is therefore aſſured us by the Spirit, not becauſe it is the hardeſt point, but becauſe it is the ground of all faith. *Perhaps, becauſe our Divines often call the Scriptures, an undoubted principle, the firſt principle, you think they hold this principle like the firſt principles in Sciences, which are therefore indemonſtrable becauſe they are of themſelves as evident as any reaſon you can bring to make them more evident.* *Anſ.*

*Anſ.* No, I had better reaſon for it than the expreſſions of their own Divines, although we need no more, if they in effect confeſſe as much as will ſerve us in the diſpute. But it is impoſſible for them or any other to fix a foot in Divinity but upon this ground: or elſe we ſhall have no other aſſurance for the laſt reſolution of faith, than what we have in kind for *Virgil's* or *Cicero's* works. Yea, moreover their own Divines give this character of the Scripture, becauſe it is true of it: it is not true, becauſe they ſay it: and yet if it were true, becauſe they ſay it: we make uſe of the Concluſion. Or if it be *an unqueſtioned principle, becauſe it is already granted to be God's word by all parties*, then why doth my Adverſary call this into queſtion, which is the ſubject of the queſtion, and by *all parties granted?* And alſo this makes it to be a common principle, that *it is granted by all parties.* And therefore are we to be tryed by it, as by a common principle: and not by the Church, which is not granted by all parties to be that we ſhould be tryed by; ſpecially, if it be aſſumed that the Roman Church is the onely Church: for then there will be a double Controverſie; one *in theſi*, whether all faith is ultimately to be reſolved by the Church; and then another *in hypotheſi* whether the Roman be the Church.

But we now put together that which he diſtinguiſheth, the *Scripture is an undoubted principle and the firſt principle, but not as the principle of Sciences which are therefore indemonſtrable, &c.*

*&c.* We diſcourſe thus, That which is indemonſtrable *is as the principle of Sciences* : but that which is as *evident as any reaſon* can be brought for *it to make it more evident*, is indemonſtrable ; therefore is it as a principle of Sciences. The propoſition is with my Adverſary the propertie of the firſt principles in Sciences. The Aſſumption is with my Adverſary the very *ratio formalis indemonſtrabilitatis* : ſo then, if the Scripture to be the word of God be as evident as any reaſon that can be brought for *it to make it more evident*, then we have what we now contend for : Now then if the Scripture cannot be demonſtrated to be the word of God by the Church *a priori* ; then is it as evident as any reaſon can be brought for it : but *verum prius* : for the Church muſt be demonſtrated by the Scriptures, as we have often proved. And if the Scripture were demonſtrated by the Church *a priori*, then were the Church the cauſe of Scripture ; which they themſelves do not ſay : and therefore may we give a *reaſon* of the Church by the Scripture, and not infallibly of the Scripture by the Church ; and therefore is it as *a prime principle in Sciences, indemonſtrabls.*

And yet my Adverſary would circumvent me in the next number, and bring me into a circle, thinking that I am bound to give another proof by the Spirit why by the Spirit I do believe that the Scripture is the word of God : but we ſtop him at firſt before he goes his rounds, for he ſuppoſeth that which is not to be ſuppoſed, that the teſtimony of the Spirit is not ſuf-

ficient to make it ſelf good to us of it ſelf, and that therefore we need another *revelation ſecure from all illuſion*, to aſcertain me the former.

*Anſ.* This is little leſſe than trifling: for firſt, we ſay, not this internall teſtimony is proveable to others: faith objective is proveable by Scripture; but faith ſubjective is not proved: but ſomewhat ſhewed by a good life: for faith works by love, as St. *Paul*. And *optimus Syllogiſmus bona vita*, as he ſaid, the beſt argument, to others, we have of faith, is a good life. But ſecondly, we are as ſecure of the not being deceived in the teſtimony of the Spirit, as the Apoſtles were in the kind. Yea, if we cannot be aſcertained by the ſame teſtimony, then how can the Council be aſſured that they are infallibly aſſiſted by the Spirit. Yea, thirdly, we are upon the higher ground for the aſſecuration of our faith, becauſe we reſolve it into that which is antecedent to the Church: and therefore have they leſſe cauſe to put us upon intergatories why we believe the Scriptures: for if we do not believe it for it ſelf, we have no reaſon to believe the Church.

To his *Dilemma* then, *Either I try the Spirit whether it be of God or no*; if I *do not*, how am I *then ſecure? If* I *doe*, *by what infallible means?* If I ſay *by the Scripture*, you *muſt needs laugh*, *becauſe you ſpeak of the firſt act of belief*, *&c.*

*Anſ.*

*Anſ.* We ſay firſt, that he miſapplieth the text of the Apoſtle, *Trie the Spirits*: it is not meant of the Spirit of God I hope he thinks, but of the Spirits of men; which is our argument againſt them: and therefore can we not ſit down with abſolute belief to what is propoſed by man till we ſee it center'd upon the word of God, which we believe infallibly came from God. Secondly, the tryall of the Spirits there injoined is by examining the matter whether proportionable to the word of faith: but here he draws it to the triall of Scripture it ſelf, which is the rule of triall. Thirdly, though we do not try the teſtimony of the Spirit atteſting to us the truth of Scripture, yet the matter of Scripture may we compare with univerſall tradition; which ſerves us for our uſe in the miniſtry of the Church; not for our faith in the cauſality thereof. 1 Joh. 4. 1.

Fourthly, to be even with my Adverſaries: we return them their *Dilemma*; they ſay we muſt believe the Scripture to be the word of God by the teſtimony of the Church, which, they ſay, is infallible, but we muſt infallibly know that this teſtimony of the Church is infallible by the Spirit of truth, which leads us into all truth. And this cannot be infallibly known but by a *Revelation ſecure from all illuſion.* And how come they *by this revelation*? *Either* they *try the Spirit or not*: if not, how can they be ſecure? If they doe; by *what infallible means*? If they ſay by the Church, we muſt needs *laugh*, becauſe we ſpeak *of the firſt act of belief*, by *which we firſt begin to believe* the Church *to be*

*infallible.* Therefore all his *agains* are ſent back again: and the iſſue of all will come to this; either this faith of the Scripture to be the word of God muſt be reſolved into the teſtimony of the Spirit, or of the Church: not of the Church, becauſe the teſtimony thereof is reſolved into Scripture, of which the queſtion is, yea, if the teſtimony of the Church were infallible, it muſt be infallibly proved by the Scripture; and alſo that it is our rule of faith. But thus we ſee the importunity of the Pontifician for their cauſe: if we ſhould ſay we reſolve our faith of the Scriptures into the teſtimony of the Church, they would never aſk us a reaſon of our faith: but when we ſay we reſolve it into the internall teſtimony of the Spirit for our own private aſſurance, they will not let us ſit down with that, but will demand a proof thereof; although the teſtimony of the Church, if it were the formall reaſon of our faith muſt be infallibly made good to us by the internall teſtimony of the Spirit, but that which they would have us reſt in for the Church, we may not reſt in for the Scripture. And yet alſo have we other arguments from Scripture it ſelf which have more moment in them unto the belief of Scripture, than the meer teſtimony of the Church, as Dr. *White* notes in the twenty ſixth p. of the way to the true Church which is worthy to be peruſed alſo upon this account, that there are ſeverall teſtimonies collected even of Papiſts for the belief of Scripture without dependence upon the Church: as of *Caniſius*, *Bellarmin*, *Biel*, *Gregorie* of *Valence*, *Stapleton*; ſome whereof we have quoted allready. So then by my Adverſaries

ſaries own argument, if we need not depend upon the Church for belief of Scripture; then not for other points of faith.

The thirtieth Article hath nothing in it conſiderable but for us, firſt, that he ſaith it to be *that moſt fundamentall Article, that ſuch and ſuch books be infallibly God's word.* So then if it be *the moſt fundamentall article*, then it is alſo fundamentall to the Church: otherwiſe it is not *that moſt fundamentall* article, but the Church muſt be the moſt fundamentall article. And if it be fundamental to the Church, then we reſolve our faith in the higheſt principle, and that which is *primo primum:* and the Papiſts reſolve themſelves into that which is at beſt but *ſecundo primum.* Our faith then being rooted in Scripture, we can give a check to their vaunting of the priviledge of the Church, as St. *Paul* did to the Jew; "but "if thou boaſteſt, thou doſt not bear the root, "but the root thee: ſo the Church doth not bear the Scripture, but the Scripture it.

And ſecondly, we note in his thirtieth number what he ſaith, *Take the Church without any infallible aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt and their authority is but humane*; We aſſume: this infallible aſſiſtance is not yet proved; and till it be proved, the authority is but humane: and yet doe we not *ſcoff* at the authority of the Church, as he chargeth us: but do make good *uſe* of it without infallibility.

And thirdly, we might note that if ſome other had the anſwering of theſe papers he might tell them that they are mendicants of the queſtion: for

for firſt, here they ſay, that they *ground this point upon the authority of the Church as being infallible.* And then again, *ſhe hath an infallible authority, which we account a fanſie* : and yet again, *this infallibility alone muſt be that which groundeth not this perſwaſion but this infallible aſſent.* And yet again, *take the Church ——without any infallible aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt and their authority is but humane.* Theſe things ſo nearly belonging and eſſentially to the queſtion are to be proved, not ſuppoſed : yet all muſt be ſuppoſed by them, that ſo they might not ſeem to run at the ring and hit it, as we may ſpeak, only the laſt hath a truth in it, but alſo it ſuppoſeth in the drift a ſuppoſition for their uſe.

But at the laſt we have an appearance of an argument, *We have no other infallible ground left us but the authority of the Church aſſiſted by the Holy Ghoſt ſince the Scripture hath no where revealed which books be Scripture, which not.*

*Anſ.* To this we ſay three things : firſt, that the argument is no way cogent, becauſe there is no neceſſity of either, if we can be aſſured by the Holy Ghoſt that theſe books be Canonicall. And if we cannot how did the Church at firſt aſſure it ſelf that they were Canonicall ? So then *Omne reducitur ad principium*, as *Aquinas*'s rule is. Secondly, unleſſe they prove the authority of the Church better, they had better have left this out ; for otherwiſe there is no ground of faith, unleſſe our ground be admitted,

ted, if this be a true Diſ-junctive propoſition, that either the Scripture muſt ſet down which books be Canonicall, which not, or elſe the Church in the propoſall muſt be infallible. And yet if the Scripture ſhould have ſet down which books were Canonicall, it muſt be reſolved whether that book, wherein they were ſet down was Canonicall, by the Holy Ghoſt alſo. Then thirdly, if the disjunctive be not true, then his diſcourſe is falſe: if it be true in the propoſition, then we aſſume againſt them that the Scripture hath no where revealed whether the Church is infallible; and therefore there is no other way to know it to be infallible but by it ſelfe: So then it muſt prove the teſtimony of the H. G. by it ſelf: and if it can, then may we prove the teſtimony of the Holy Ghoſt concerning Scripture by it ſelfe: if not, where will they ſet up?

In the 31. Num. he would ſquat, and deceive the chaſe by a diſtinction, which will not ſtay him from running round in the proving of Scripture by the Church, and the Church by Scripture. He ſayes, *No Sir, you never heard me give this reaſon, unleſſe it were when I ſpake to one who independently of the Church do profeſſe himſelf to believe the Scripture to be God's word, as you do.* And this is the effect of this Number for his defence, and of thoſe Divines, *who do not deale thus in proving the Church by the Scripture with all thoſe who have not admitted the Scripture as infallible: for they firſt prove the authority of the Church (and that independently of the Scripture) to be infallible.* Num. 31.

*Anſw.*

*Anſw.* This covering is too ſhort, and indeed not ſound; for I am not bound to take notice how they prove it to others, but how they prove it to me. If they prove it thus to me, then, by their owne confeſſion, they are included in a circle. And they prove it thus to me, becauſe I hold the Scripture to be God's word independently of the Church; and ſo he ſaith of me, [*as you do.*] Secondly, whereas he ſayes, *If I be a Scholar, I may know* that their *Divines* do not anſwer ſo when they are put upon the queſtion, *Why do you believe the Church?* I do anſwer, that for my part I never pretended to be a Scholar, as they do, *ſignanter.* I have neither head, nor heart, nor body, nor books for the Controverſies: but yet this I know, that *de officio*, this is the way of conſtituting, and ſo of diſtinguiſhing the Church: and *de facto*, this is the way that S. *Auſtin*, and alſo ſome of their owne Divines do prove the Church by: yea, this is the way which my Adverſaries muſt take and do. And thirdly, neither do we ſay, that we believe the Scripture to be the word of God by the teſtimony of the Spirit, but to thoſe who do profeſſe the beliefe of the Scripture to be the word of God. And therefore are we even with them in this kinde: for as they deale with Heathens as to the proofe of Scripture by the Church: ſo do we alſo, as the Fathers were wont by the Church univerſal. And I can uſe the authority of the Church as an inducement unto the Heathen, although the Pontificians cannot uſe the authority of the Church to me as the determinative of faith. So then if they can prove the authority of the Church infallibly to be infal-

infallible without dependence upon the Scripture, they ſhall indeed ſpeak to *the purpoſe*: Otherwiſe they are ſhut up *in a circle*, out of which they can never move their foot.

The thirty ſecond number hath in it much and little——— *longæ*, Num. 32.

*Ambages: ſed ſumma ſequor faſtigia rerum.*

The intendment of it is to fix the wheel, by aſſuring the Church to be infallible without running to the Scripture.

In the beginning of it it would prove their faith good, becauſe they believed thoſe, who delivered it, had *Commiſſion* from God. But this ſatisfieth not, becauſe the queſtion rebounds upon them, why they believed that thoſe, who delivered it had Commiſſion from God. If they ſay they had aſſurance thereof by the Spirit, then they come to our kind of aſſurance.

Therefore they determine this belief upon two motives; one comming from the Doctrine in order to God, change of life; the other from God in order to the Doctrine, in miracles, and there he amplifies in two leaves, which might have been diſpatched in three words. Indeed the firſt he ſays not much of; for it is no concluding argument. For firſt, it doth not diſtinguiſh Doctrines: for thus the Jew, the Arrian, the Socinian, the Sectary might prove his Doctrine infallible. Secondly, the good life, if it were a reſult of Doctrine, yet not from the points of difference, but the generall fundamentalls of Chriſtian faith, wherein the Controverſies lie not. Yea, thirdly, if this new life did proceed by way of emanation or abſolute connexion from the points of difference, we might join iſſue with them and have the better. Yea,

fourthly, *Judas* had a right Commiſſion and yet no good life. Yea, fifthly, the manners are rather to be proved good by the practicall Doctrine, than ſpeculative Doctrine (if any Doctrine ultimately be ſuch) proved good by manners. Therefore good life is no τεκμήριον of Divine Doctrine; nor yet of a Divine Commiſſion. Yea, ſixthly, *Dato non conceſſo*, that we might know the Church, and Doctrine of it to be infallible by good life; yet this is not conformable to their poſtulate, that God ſhould teach us all verity by the mouth of the Church, as *Stapleton* ſpeaks.

Then as to the other motive of faith in the true Church, namely, miracles, we can ſay ſeverall things; firſt *in theſi*, miracles are no certain diſtinctive of a Divine Commiſſion, becauſe the man of ſin may deceive by lying wonders, as St. *Paul* ſpeaks 2 *Theſ.* 2. 9. And alſo *Moſes*, *Deut.* 13. 1, 2. Then this is no infallible motive for the believing of a *Commiſſion from God*, becauſe we may be deceived in it. And although upon ſuppoſition of a true miracle we might conclude a Commiſſion from God; yet this is not the way infallible becauſe we may be deceived in the truth of the miracle, whether it be ſuch or not: ſince the miracle cannot *fidem facere de ſe*, as the teſtimony of the Spirit can. Secondly, the gift of miracles was a gift common to thoſe who were not all Prophets as to penning of the Scripture; and alſo not common, for ought we know, to ſome who did, as St. *Mark* and S. *Luke*, therefore this is not ſufficient to reſolve our faith in their Commiſſion, becauſe not given *Omni* nor *ſoli*: for whatſoever doth diſtinguiſh muſt have it ſelf *per modum differentiæ*.

*ferentiæ.* Thirdly, therefore ſiuce we muſt have faith to believe the miracles to be true, we aſk how we come to this faith: if by the operation of the Spirit; then faith ultimately is fixed upon our foundation, namely, the teſtimony of the Spirit, by which we may as well be aſſured that the Scripture is the true word of God, as that miracles are true. Fourthly, the gift of miracles was temporary and accomodated for that ſeaſon of the Church. And therefore cannot we prove by miracles new Doctrines, as Invocation of Saints, worſhipping of Images, Communion in one kinde, Tranſubſtantiation, Supremacy of the Roman Biſhop: therefore if miracles did infallibly aſcertain the divine Commiſſion of the *Prophets and Apoſtles* to ſpeak and write: yet are not we ſatisfied by them in the queſtion of new Doctrines, which the Scripture gives us no account of; but therefore he comes to *Oral tradition.* For, as for his reaſoning in form thus, *in hypotheſi, The Preachers preached the Doctrine of our Church; God confirmed their Doctrine by miracles: therefore the Doctrine of our Church was confirmed by miracles*, it is λόγος ἀσυλλόγιστος. For firſt (not to carp at the form of his ſyllogiſm) we ſay to the propoſition, that if they preached the Doctrine of the Roman Church as differently from the whole Church, they preached what they ought not to preach; and ſo the *minor* propoſition is falſe. If they did preach the ſame doctrine which the whole Church received in Scripture from the Apoſtles, then we grant the *minor* and the concluſion too, as much as doctrine can be confirmed by miracles; but we diſtinguiſh of the time when the miracles were wrought; namely in the time of the Apoſtles, and by them. For, as for miracles done by S. *Auſtin* to confirm *the ſame faith* which we *aboliſhed in* our

*reformation*; we ſay that *Bede* and *Gregory* and *Brierly*, whom he quotes for teſtimony hereof, are not to us ſurely of ſufficient authority in their own cauſe. Nay ſecondly, they had beſt not add the teſtimony of the learned *Magdeburgians*, leſt they be aſhamed to ſlight them in other matters; but alſo chiefly upon this conſideration; becauſe, if the points of difference were confirmed by *many miracles*, (which he refers us to *Brierly* in his Index for) then by the Argument before, thoſe points of difference were new: for as miracles have themſelves to faith; ſo new miracles to new faith. And if it was a new faith, then it was not received by *oral tradition* from the Apoſtles ſucceſſively: and then they are undone. Therefore let them ſpeak no more to us of the miracles of S. *Auſtin* the Monk, who ſhewed nothing ſo much wonderful as his pride in obtruding upon old Chriſtians, ancienter than *Tertullian*'s Preſcriptions; therefore it is too much curteſie to take any notice of what he ſaies about the faith brought into *England* by S. *Auſtin*: and yet we can make uſe of it too: for if it be ſo as he ſaies, that the *faith brought into England by St.* Auſtin *was the ſame faith which* was *aboliſhed by* our *reformation* then we have aboliſhed none but the Roman faith: and the Chriſtian faith in the general principles of it we had before. And this might be enough for the virtue of miracles: but that he ſaies miracles are called *a teſtimony greater than John the Baptiſt*. Are they ſo? then we take leave to ſhew what his words in two places will come to, even in the ſame page 72. before in the ſame p. he had ſaid that a miracle doth not make a thing ſo *prudently credible as univerſal tradition*; here he ſaies that a miracle is a greater teſtimony than *John the Baptiſt*: whence we argue thus; That which is greater than that which is greater

ter

ter is greater than that which is leſs: miracles are here ſaid to be *greater teſtimony than John the Baptiſt*; and *John the Baptiſt's* teſtimony was greater than of Univerſal Tradition; then miracles are a greater teſtimony than of univerſal Tradition. But let this paſs.

And now we ſhall touch upon what he ſaies about Tradition: ſaving that we muſt ſmile at what he ſaies about the truth of their miracles, that there is as little to be ſaid againſt them, as againſt the miracles of the *Prophets and Apoſtles*. This is not to be anſwered until the miracles of the Maid of *Kent* may be compared with thoſe of *Elijah* and *S. Peter*, and until their Doctrine, which they would have confirmed by their miracles, be found as good and authentick as that of the Apoſtles, which was confirmed by their miracles. But to Tradition we come. *Thus was the firſt age aſſured of God's word by the oral tradition of the firſt Paſtors of the Church, who had received it in the name of God from the Apoſtles, who gave their Writings to them.*

*Anſ.* This is not much to their purpoſe. For firſt, unleſs oral tradition did exclude the divine teſtimony of Gods Spirit, they cannot ſay that the *firſt Age* was aſſured by this and not by that. And this teſtimony is not excluded neither by oral tradition nor by miracles ſimply: for Gods Spirit might aſſure them of the truth of each: and then the laſt ground of faith is the teſtimony of the Spirit. Secondly, let orall tradition be reſtrained as to object of thing: or let it equally be proved of the new points forementioned, otherwiſe they have not by orall tradition ſufficient benefit. Thirdly, notwithſtanding the Apoſtles own preachings, which were more than oral tradition, and notwithſtanding all miracles done by the Apoſtles, which both equally had themſelves

to

to all then hearers of the one or ſpectators of the other yet as many as were ordained to eternal life believed *Acts* 13.48. So that the belief did effectually follow upon the efficacy of the Spirit of God applying the means of faith home to their Conſciences. It is not ſaid as many as did believe were ordained to eternall life, as if the belief foreſeen had it ſelf *antecedenter* to the ordination; but as many as were ordained to eternall life believed. Fourthly, as for the *Jews and Proſelytes* they had alſo, who lived in the time of Chriſt, for the means of their aſſurance, *Moſes* and the Prophets; who had propheſied of Chriſt and Chriſtian Doctrine.

And as for that which follows, that *the firſt Paſtors (beſides their oral tradition) did aſſure them that the Spirit of God would abide with the Church, teaching her all truth, &c.* We anſwer, firſt, if the firſt Paſtors did teach any thing, they could teach nothing but what they received *from the Apoſtles who gave their writings to them*, as before: and why then may not we take it better from the writings of the Apoſtles than from their teaching? for *primum in ſuo genere eſt menſura reliquorum*. But ſecondly, where have they ſufficient inducement of belief either by orall tradition, or miracles, or whatſoever prudential motives, that this reſpects the Church under the formality of a Repreſentative? Yea, thirdly therefore, if ſo, how was it made true to the Church in thoſe Centuries wherein there was no formall Repreſentative; namely, for 200 *years and more* wherein *they had nothing but tradition to make them give an infallible aſſent to their Church*, as himſelf ſays in this Paragraph? Fourthly, if this promiſe attended the Church under the account of a Repreſentative, yet of the whole Church: and what is this to the Roman Church which is but a part even in St. *Jeroms* judge-

judgement in his Epiſtle to *Evagrius*? Yea, alſo fifthly, that promiſe was not ſpoken by the Apoſtles to the Church, but by Chriſt to the Apoſtles, and therefore can it not be drawn down in a parallel line to all the ages of the Church: and therefore that which follows in the 71 p. is without any foundation. *Debile fundamentum fallit opus.*

But he reinforceth the power of unlverſal tradition. *Now there is nothing which can make any thing more prudently credible than univerſall tradition*, and ſo he prefers it to a *miracle*.

*Anſ.* And have they vouched univerſal tradition? by univerſall tradition they may be caſt: for they cannot find univerſall tradition for their ſupernumerary points: and there was univerſal tradition for ſome points which they have caſt off, as before; namely, the millenary point, and infant baptiſm. So then, by their own argument, they are unprovided of ſuch a proof *than which nothing can make a thing more prudently credible*. Secondly, if he means by the terms [*prudently credible*] preciſely ſuch, then he derogates from infallibility: and ſo all this diſcourſe comes ſhort of the ſtate of the queſtion, which reſpects infallible aſſurance. If he means it ſubordinatly to that which makes infallible aſſurance, then why doth he inſiſt upon this as the *primum mobile* of all faith? and then let them tell us what that is which doth abſolutely fix belief, and determines doubting. And ſurely the terms he uſeth *per ſe* do ſeem to be *termini diminuentes*, that which is urg'd as *prudently* credible abſtracts neceſſarily from that which is infallibly credible: for they are *ſub diverſo genere*. And ſo when all comes to all, upon the whole matter, and at the foot of the account, all faith goes no higher than a prudentiall aſſent. Then thirdly, therefore as

to

to the force of the Argument, he hath no Adversary; for we can say so to, *Nothing can make any thing more prudently credible than universall tradition:* and we can make use of this motive as well as the Roman, yea, somewhat better, because he will shrink the whole Church into one City of *Rome*. But fourthly, suppose nothing in the kind of that which is prudently credible, as such, were above universall tradition: yet this concludes not rightly that absolutely, or in an higher kind nothing is more credible: for this testimony of the Spirit, which is not yet disproved, makes a thing not only prudently credible, but necessarily and in the way of Divine faith. And that which is prudently credible doth not include this: but this eminently includes that which is prudentiall credibility.

Yet he goes on. *Yet here I intreat you to mark how they resolv'd* their *faith then*, &c. namely, in the space of *the* 200 *years and more* wherein *they had nothing but tradition to make them give an infallible assent to their Church.*

*Ans.* This I have marked and not precariously. But what shall I see in it that will give a sober man any satisfaction? For first, what if they did *believe the soul to be immortall, because God said it by the Church*; and the Church, because *it said that it had Commission from God, as authorized with infallibility*; and did also believe this because the Church said so; and why so, *because they would do so*? what of all this? therefore we are not infallibly assured that the Scripture is the word of God by the testimony of the Spirit? If they did believe indeed in way of a Divine faith, then the Spirit of God did assure them by tradition. For otherwise they

they forſake the antient Theological account of faith; and they muſt either ſay, that faith is not an habit infuſed; or that it may be an habit infuſed without the Spirit of God. but if they believed improperly, or in the way of humane faith, (as we doe believe there are ſeven hills at *Rome*, without univerſall tradition or a miracle) then this is not to the purpoſe; for the diſcourſe is peccant in the ignorance of the *Elench*: we can ſay as much without contradiction to our cauſe. Secondly, they cannot ſurely expect that we ſhould gratifie them ſo much as to ſay there is as much reaſon to believe tradition now as then, becauſe now they themſelves will ſay, that we have the benefit of what aſſurance the generall Councils can make. And alſo 3. we muſt here note out of their own words, for the uſe of our cauſe, that for the ſpace of 200 *years and more they had nothing but tradition to make them give an infallible aſſent to their Church*: So then for the ſame ſpace they had not the coroboration of generall Councils: and therefore theſe do not make the reaſon of belief ſimply as they would have it, becauſe the Church was ſo long without them. 4. Though the univerſal comprehends particulars, yet a particular doth not comprehend an univerſal: therefore whatſoever aſſent is due to tradition univerſal is not due to tradition particular of *Rome*. This is their trick to build all upon the common ground of the whole Church: and then to incloſe the univerſall Church within the walls of *Rome*. This we muſt enter our plea againſt upon all occaſions. 5. We ſee they are come off unto ſome latitude in their conception of faith, becauſe the laſt reſolution in this queſt of faith they make to be thus, and *they would do ſo becauſe they would do ſo*, and again, *becauſe it had been more folly not to accept of this*

*Church's Commiſſion to teach them infallibly all truths*: So that now the acquiſcence of the ſoul in the deep miſtery of faith muſt be terminated and determined upon the variable point and principle of prudence; and that which muſt eternaly ſetle our mind in the firſt and laſt ground of infallibility, muſt be this; *we do ſo becauſe* we will *do ſo, or becauſe it were folly not to believe*. So then, ſince, *currente rota*, the diſcourſe is come to this; let us have our liberty to believe as we do believe, becauſe we ſee it to be *folly* (for ought can be ſeen by them) to accept the *Church's Commiſſion to teach infallibly all truths*. Sixthly, if they ſay *all truths*, then they ſeem to be fallen from their former Conceſſion, and alſo *Stapleton's*, that ſome truths may be believed without neceſſity of the Church. Seventhly, as for the *immortality of the ſoul*, which they inſiſt in to have been believed, *becauſe God ſaid it by the Church*, we ſay eaſily, that this might with leſſe difficulty be received from the Church, becauſe it is ſurely probable, and ſome will ſay demonſtrable, by reaſon: and therefore is not only aſſerted by *Plato*, who might have it from the Jewes by redundance in *Ægypt*, (whither he and *Pythagoras* and ſome others travelled for wiſdom, as *Juſtin Martyr* witneſſeth) but alſo in effect, as I think, by *Ariſtotle*. And alſo here certainly they muſt be put to diſtinguiſh betwixt the Church of *Rome* and the whole Church; or elſe his words are not true; or elſe Pope *John* the 22. did not belong to the Church; for he did not commend to others the Faith of the Immortality of the Soul.

And yet he goes on. *Which Commiſſion, to teach them infallibly all truth they knew by tradition to have*

*have been ever accepted as Divine by all good people.* This reaſon, if I may ſay ſo, is ſurely full of it ſelf, but not ſolid, for it doth in effect run round again; and the Faith of the Church is proved by the Church: for they make *all good people* to be convertible with the Church: and therefore they make the holy Catholick Church to be the viſible. But how then is the Church *Regula regulata*, the Rule ruled, as hath been confeſſed before? Secondly, muſt we content our ſelves with this in the grand concernment of faith, becauſe the Church did accept this Commiſſion as Divine, which we know by Tradition? but how ſhall we know this Tradition to be of the Church, before we know the Church? Are they adviſed of this? then muſt we come to be aſſured of the Doctrine before we be aſſured of the Church. And this Doctrine we muſt be aſſured of independently of the Church, becauſe we cannot know the Church but by the Doctrine; and by the Doctrine of the Scripture too, as S. *Auſtin* diſcourſeth againſt the *Donatiſts*. Thirdly, if all good people know by tradition this Commiſſion to be divine, then my Adverſary needed not to have pinched the laſt reſolution of faith ſo as to have ſaid, they believed, *becauſe they would do ſo*, or *becauſe it had been meer folly not to accept this commiſſion*: for though univerſal Tradition cannot tranſcend its ſphere unto a cauſality of proper faith divine; yet hath it more reaſon in it than to make a generall beliefe arbitrary, or to preſerve the act of it from folly in the negative. A Divine aſſurance will not be compared with a negative prudence: but univerſal tradition doth ſurpaſs it. We had beſt then compound the difference

betwixt himself by a kind of division thus, negative prudence was suitable to his former proof (*Aqua ascendit quantum descendit*) but Divine assurance (which I suppose he urgeth by tradition) is necessary for the question. For the certainty of faith is such as *cui non potest subesse falsum*, in which there can be no falsity: and therefore probability cannot make faith; and negative prudence can amount no higher than probability. Fourthly, if we must now set the *basis* and the foundation of all Divine faith in universal tradition, then Mr. *Chillingworth* carries the victory clearly from the Romanist: for this he disputed for in opposition to the Roman. Fifthly, *All good people* cannot make a demonstration or faith of a Conclusion. And we have cause to note this as invalid, because if goodness of manners were simply probative of true faith, then we should be all nought in the Roman opinion, because we differ with them in faith: for if we had been all *good people*, we should have accepted their grounds; and hence we see their pretended reason of uncharitableness to us; wherein they communicate with Sects or Sects with them. But if goodness of life be so profitable for proof of truth, then my Adversary with the rest of the Pontificians do not so wisely distinguish betwixt morality and infallibility in their Popes: For surely then *Gregory* the seventh had been no good head of the Church; nor *Alexander* the sixth, who surely laughed in his sleeve when he said to an Ambassadour, *Quantum lucri nobis peperit illa fabula de Christo*, I had thought goodnesse had not belonged to a professor of Divinity, as such. Indeed it becoms all Scholars to be very good: but this is one of the first times that I heard of this argument. Let them therefore put in some formall principle of discerning truth,

as

as goodneſs is not; unleſs the will can preſcribe to the judgement, as the judgement to the will, and if it can, they have the worſe cauſe. Therefore may we conclude this long Paragraph with a ſober denial of what he concludes it with: *the ground upon which you believe Scripture* to be the word of God, *is thought to be Chimærical by ſome of your beſt Writers*. It is proved otherwiſe, and that it is not accounted fooliſh or Chimerical by ſome of the beſt of our Writers; we have ſeen before; neither Mr. *Hooker* nor Mr. *Chillingworth*: nay, nor by ſome of their beſt Writers neither, as *Stapleton*; beſides ſome others quoted by Dr. *White*, as before. But if he would ſtand to St. *Auſtin*, he might have ſpared this diſpute about Scripture; for we are not to diſpute the truth of Scripture, he ſays, as of other writings. To conclude then this number in kind, we might as well take the boldneſſe to ſay, that their ground upon which they ſtand in the maintenance of their faith as different from us, is,

Πρόσθε λέων ὄπιθεν δ' ὄφις, μέσση δὲ χίμαιρα.

A Lion before, a Dragon behind, and a Chimera in the middle.

In this number he urgeth unſecurity of our grounding faith, as to the ignorant, in tranſlations: but this hath been by him preſſed before, and by me anſwered: and nothing is here replied by him: but ſomewhat more is promiſed, ch. 4. n. 9. And therefore might we ſkip it, but it may be he would interpret our omiſſion to his advantage. He ſays then. *How unſecurely the greater part of your Religion did ground their faith, becauſe they muſt truſt the tranſlations of private men, and believe them rather and uſe them ra-* Num. 34.

*ther than the tranſlations uſed by the Church in Generall Councils.*

*Ecce iterum Criſpinus* ---- but we anſwer, in this he would have three propoſitions granted him; one, that Generall Councils did uſe their Latine tranſlation. Secondly, that our tranſlations are the off-ſpring of private men. Thirdly, that moſt of us muſt ground their faith in the truſt of private mens tranſlations. To theſe we anſwer in three words, and in generall, denying all of them. As to the firſt, we ſay that the General Councils which were celebrated in *Greece* did not ſurely make uſe of the Latine tranſlation. Nay, ſecondly, their Latine tranſlation, which they would have to be *Jerom's* for antiquity, was not at firſt received in the Church, but denied by St. *Auſtin*. Yea, thirdly, their Latine tranſlation, which now they uſe cannot be St. *Jerom's*: for I hope it was mended by *Sixtus Quintus*, and again refined by *Clement* the eighth and ſurely though it was Canonized by the Trent Council before it was made; yet ſurely it was not made currant in the Church for uſe before it was born. And if they ſay, there is no reall and materiall difference betwixt their Latine as now and in antient times, we ſay firſt, abſolutely, that *Iſider Clarius*, who came after *Clement*, will then find fault with both in ſeverall thouſand places. But then alſo we ſay in compare, neither are there any reall and materiall differences in our Engliſh from the original. But fourthly, did the Generall Councils uſe the Latine tranſlation for their Judge in Scripture, then are not the Generall Councils infallible, becauſe that tranſlation was not infallibly made; nor made infallible by the Church even in the Trent Council,

Council, as ſome of their own have intimated, as before.

To the ſecond propoſition, we give alſo a denial. Our Engliſh tranſlation is not to be accounted the tranſlation of private men; becauſe it is authorized by our Church, although at firſt made by private men: And what if they yet made good to hinder as great an aſſiſtance of the ſpirit of God to the eſtabliſhment of this Tranſlation, as they finde for their Remiſh Teſtament. That which is made by private men is made more than private by authority of the Church. And if they deny this diſtinction, they undo all their Councils. And if they ſay our Church hath it ſelf, as a private part, to the whole: ſo we ſay doth the Roman, ἐξ ἁπλῶν.

Thirdly, As to the third propoſition, we deny it alſo: the moſt do not truſt in the Tranſlations: nay, none do truſt in Tranſlations, ſimply; becauſe they are not Scripture, as *per ſe*; but analogically to the Scripture in the originall. So that ultimately they are aſſured, that the tranſlation is in the matter agreeable to Scripture, as they are aſſured that the Scripture is the word of God, namely, through faith infuſed by the Spirit of God. So they do not believe the Tranſlation, but that which is tranſlated. The Tranſlation formally is no mean to aſſure their Faith; but is a mean of conveyance of it to their knowledge. And ſurely our people may as well believe that the Tranſlation is as free from all damnative error; as their people may believe what their Church propoſeth to be free from damnative error: firſt, becauſe they rely upon a Tranſlation that teach, and a Tranſlation not ſo good, Secondly, becauſe our people can con-

ſult the Tranſlation: ſo cannot their people underſtand the Vulgar Latine: and therefore if thoſe who tranſlated it were not deceived, yet thoſe who propoſe it may deceive the people: and thirdly, becauſe the authority of their Tranſlation were *far greater*, yet was it made by thoſe Prieſts of theirs *deeply intereſſed in this cauſe*; as well as he ſaies our might be by private Miniſters deeply intereſſed in this cauſe: and alſo becauſe yet is not their Tranſlation infallible, as hath been proved: and therefore cannot the people believe the Church. And the Argument is thus: If the Church of *Rome* were infallible then in the Tranſlation of the Bible; and the reaſon of the conſequence is demonſtrated from the end of it appointed in the fourth ſeſſion of the Trent Council, *Ut in publicis lectionibus, diſputationibus, prædicationibus et expoſitionibus pro authentica habeatur*: this the end of the inſtitution of it, that in all readings, diſputations, preachings and expoſitions, it ſhould be held for authentick; and therefore if ever they would put out all their power of infallibility, then ſurely in this tranſlation; but now *falſum poſterius*; this tranſlation is not infallible, as hath been proved and confeſſed by ſome of their learnedſt men; as alſo might be inſtanced in the reading of *ipſa* for *ipſum*, attributing that to the Virgin which all the tranſlation, (with the Hebrew) in our great Bible attribute to the Seed, namely, to Chriſt, *Gen.* 3. 15. Therefore may we ſurely as well believe our tranſlations as they their Church. Therefore let them hereafter not ſend us ſuch arguments as will be returnable with uſe.

This

This thirty fifth Paragraph he might also have forborn, wherein he thought to pinch me with uncertainty of true copies of the original. For this will fall upon them in the full weight, for we have as good Copies of the Originals as the Romans; If we had ours from them, then I hope we have as good: if not, then we depended not, at first, of them. Whether we believe the Copies we have to be true by the Church, this question hath it self accidentally to the truth of the Copies, because if we have not the true Copies, the Church cannot make that which is not true to be true, as the Papists themselves confesse, and if we be led by that faith which is certain, though we are not so assured of it to be so, we may attain Salvation, may we not? If not, then have the Papists no such reason to pick a quarrel with us about certainty of Salvation in the Subject.

To speak then more punctually, we can use the Roman Copies if we had none other, without their infalibility: *Utile per inutile non vitiatur*, and if we have any others, as it should seem we have upon the true account of the antiquity of the British Churches, then we comparing them with theirs, can find that ours *are true Originals*, if theirs be. For as for the knowledge of them to be *undoubtedly true Originals* by the credit of the best Churches, this cannot rationally do it, because (if there be a doubt of the true Originals) we must first know which is the best Church by the true Original. Therefore let them tell us which Church is best to be trusted in this case, they will say, *the best*; but the question returns, which is the best? This we must know by the *true Original*, and this is it which is in question, so that we must be primarily assured some other way either of the Church or of the true Original: and what way can that be but by the testimony of the Spirit, by whom all Faith is ingenerated? and then they come about again to us *in genere*, either to be assured by the Holy Ghost that this is the best Church,

or that this is the true Original. If the latter, then by this we are assured of Scripture, if the former, then however the last resolution is by the Spirit of God.

This in general concerning the true Originals, He descends to the original of the Old Testament, *as for the Hebrew all must know that the antient Hebrew Copies were all written without points that is in substance, without vowels.*

*Answ.* If the Romans could determine all controversies by supposition as they do this, they then indeed might pretend to be Judges of all controversies: he might have considered that this hath been a mighty question as appears by the discourse about it on each part of the contradiction.

And as to this, they are wrapped into as great difficulty as we, untill they can prove two points, First that their Church put the Points or Vowells, *Puncta vocalia*, to the words. Secondly, that their Church did it infallibly, for though the Church did it, yet if theirs be not the Church, they are never the whit the nearer; and if theirs be the Church, and they did it not infallibly, they are not yet Masters of their end. Secondly, we except against his presumption *of all Copies* to be written without points; there is not the same probability as some learned men will think: because though ordinarily the words were not pointed with Vowels in every Copy, yet the King's Copy had Points to it. And thirdly, Do they think that the Moral Law was written by the Finger of God without Points? If not, then they knew commonly what Vowels should be put without the Church: for the Church did not put the points thereunto as the Pontificians think, and if the Decalogue had Points put to it by the Finger of God, then All not without Points, and why not the rest of the old Testament with points? Fourthly, Let any of my Adversaries say *Shibboleth*, and if he doth pronounce it right, let him tell me how he knows he doth pronounce right, he will say by tradition; well then yet

he

he doth not know it by the credit of a particular Church: but let him tell me how at first, this came to be pronounced by the *Gileadite*, and not *Sibboleth*, as by the *Ephramite*, Judges the 12? If then they knew that the *Punctum samin* was right, why did not the Jews know a *pari* the other points? Fiftly, Though the points were put to the Consonants afterwards, yet is it not necessary that the Epach hereof should be 476 years after Christ at the well of *Tilerias*, as *Bellarmin would have it*: For he himself saies, *That some thinks the Points were put to* (the Pentateuch) *by* Moses *or by some excellent Doctor of the Law before the time of Christ, it may be* Ezra, as some may think. Sixtly, If the Jewish Rabbies did fit vowels to the Hebrew Letters, yet surely did they not put false Points to corrupt the Text, because then surely they would have corrupted the Text in those places which speak of the Messiah to be such as Jesus was: which being not done, *Bellarmin* takes it to be an Argument that they did not corrupt the Scripture in his 2. b. *de verbo dei* 2. *chap.* And therefore, as for that famous Text in this kind *Psal.* 22. כארי for כארו *Bellarmine* saith, *That it is evidently inferred that it was an error of the Scribe in the same Chapter, because St.* Jerom, *who did profess that he did render the Hebrew strictly, renders it* foderunt. Therefore however the controversie goes betwixt *Buxtorfius* and *Capellus*, what can from hence be concluded which concerns us in *specie*? Let *Bil* be Bill, or Bell, or Ball, or Bull, yet is there nothing in Hebrew for the Pope or his Bull, whether then *the perfidious Jews had honesty enough to deliver to us true Copies, with true Points, and Vowels*, Let their *Bellarmin* be judge in the former Chap. And yet moreover, surely it is more probable, that if the Points were first put by the Jews, to the Consonants, at the well of *Tilerius*, yet they were not put by the *perfidious Jews*, if he took it for the unbelieving Jews, but by the believing Jews.

But yet my Adversary must needs object an expression

of the most Reverend, and Learned Arch-Bishop of *Armah*, *Mr Maxwell*, concerning the variety of Sections in the New Testament, which *Cressy* also takes notice of. But as to this, upon supposition, this concerns Christians, *Secundum rationem generalem*, and therefore one would think that we should not be bound to give an account of it as to an Heathen. But so the Roman adversaries must order their attains, that either there must be no Christian Faith but theirs onely. Secondly, those various Sections, do they make any substantial change in the matter of sence, or any contrariety to the Analogie of other Texts, or not? If not, what can be the consequence from hence to the Church? If so, then how can the right reading be restored by the Church but through the Holy Ghost? Well then, in a Councel also or not, if in a Councel, how was the Church herein assured for the first three hundred years? if without a Councel, then why is infallibility tied to a Councel confirmed by a Pope, as my Adversary sayes? Thirdly, we have no reason to depend upon the Roman Church for our security, in such variety of readings, since we have the more variety for them; and in *Manuscripts* too, as Dr. *Iames* asserts in his *corruption of Fathers, Councils and Scriptures*, so this comes to the Proverb, *Ovem lupo commisisti*. But fourthly, they make a very ill Argument for themselves, for if it be so uncertain, which is, not onely a true *Translation*, but also which is the true Original, then how shall we be certain whether the Church be infallible since the Assist of this point must finally be determined by Scripture? Fifthly, we may be certainly as certain as they; for we have the true Original from them, or not; if we have, then we are as well as they: if not any Original from them, then how do we depend upon them for the Christian Faith as they? If we had the Original Language from them and not the true, then they deceived us by ignorance or worse. And how should we be bound to believe in them then, as our

infalli-

ble Guides? Sixthly, That admirable Prelate did me the Honour himself to tell me upon my application to him, that as for the variety of Sections, they were observed by him to be of divers sorts, and some inconsiderable: and those of any moment not so many as there will be such danger to have them appear, for they are intended to be Printed with the great Bible.

A touch we have also in this number of St. *Matthews Gospel*, but this hath been agitated before. But yet I cannot but observe how confidently these Romanists speak, *As for the new Testament, St. Matthews Gospel was originally written in Hebrew, & that original it quite lost*: as if it were as sure as Gospel that it was written originally in Hebrew not preached onely, but written in Hebrew, and also that it was *quite lost*, if lost, we may, or may we not think upon the rule in the Trent History, he is to be suspected to be Author of a mischief who hath the interest in it?

So then, we see nothing to the contrary, but that yet the term infallibility is an *unfortunate* term, for it loseth at all turnes.

Neither will they be able to get off clearely from all *inextricable difficulties*, whatsoever they say of us. For first, they suppose that they receive the vulgar translation upon as good authority, *as those who received the first Original copies. And have they no better certainty for the first original copies?* Then they take a course to make Christianity ridiculous, but this they will say for the honour of their Church, *Ridente turcâ nec dolente judæo*, let Christianity crack so *Rome* stands. So then, by this principle of theirs, if the vulgar Latin hath no certain credibility, neither the original copies, as if the original copies had came onely from *Rome*, as the vulgar latin, but for this latin Bible we are referred to the fourth Chap. Yet here he gives me a perstriction for objecting to them *Isidor Clarius*, correcting of it in so many places. *If* Isidor Clarius *in any one title importing Faith and Man-* N. 36.

*manners, differs from what we receive upon that infallible authority, we have nothing to do with him.* And is this all?

But first, he needs not make an *if* of it, for if he will peruse but his Preface, he shall find him to profess that he used a great deal of moderation lest offence should be taken, and that it might not seem to be a new Translation, and yet he saith, *Loca tamen ad octo millia annotata, atque à nobis emendata sunt*, eight thousand places have been marked and mended by me. And do none of them, think you, respect faith and manners?

Secondly, Me thinks they are warping and coming off again to the former distinction, that the Church could not be propoſer of any damnative error, *importing Faith and Manners.* And this in Mr. *Knot*'s opinion, as before, spoiles all. So then the Church might erre, in this Translation, from the Originals, but not in things *importing Faith or Manners.*

Thirdly, Do they then think there was any fault at all in the Original Copies which the first Church received? If so, then there must be faults in Original Scripture: If not, how can they receive the vulgar Translation with an equal Faith of infalibility, as they do the Original Copies? Let Cardinal *Bellarmin* rebate somewhat that high Conceit of the Authentikneſſe of the vulgar Latin (which they know was but a product of a Council) in his 26. *de Author. Concil.* the 12. *ch.* Let them, from thence, consider whether the Scriptures are not to be preferred before the Decrees of Councels in many regards, where he will tell them, at the latter end of the Chap. that that of *Gregory*, reverencing the four Councils General, as the four Gospels is to be qualified, *illud* [ *ſicut* ] *ſonare ſimilitudinem non æqualitatem* that that [ As ] doth signifie similitude not equality, indeed, as *Iuſtin Martyr* saies of *Plato*, *That what he had ſaid well in things Divine, he doth mingle and confound with contrariety, for fear of* Mars-*hill, leſt he ſhould ſuffer for it, as* Socrates; ſo this the Cardinal doth

both seem to retract in the following words, (for fear of the seven hills) *as to equality of infallibility*, but yet *in traditis particularibus, & in judiciis morum, quæ non toti Ecclesiæ sed uni tantum aut alteri populo proponuntur*, in particular judgements, and in precepts of manners which are not proposed to the whole Church, but to one or another people, he saies *they may erre in the same Chap.* but so may not Scripture, therefore can they not receive the vulgar edition absolutely, as the first Church did receive the Original Copies, so that either my Adversary hath overshot, or the Cardinal under; and if they will have *nothing to do with him*, that in any *title importing Faith or Manners* differ from them, then they have many to excommunicate on *Munday Thursday*, though they absolve them again on *Good Friday*, as they do the King of Spain for detaining part of *St. Peters* Patrimony.

And as for the other exception I made against the vulgar, by the varieties of the Edition of *Sixtus 5tus* and clement the 8th. he refers me to a *Famous Book, called Charity maintained, written against Dr.* Potter, *See it Part 2. c. b. n.* as I take it in his Copy, but he saves me the labour, in telling me the effect of it thus, That, *by Authentical testimonies of persons beyond all exception, is shewed (there) that the decree of* Sixtus 5tus *about his Edition was never promulged, and that he had declared divers things to have crept in, which needed a second review, and that the whole work should be re-examined though he could not do it, being prevented by death.*

*Answ.* according to their principles, no *Authentique testimony* but of a Council confirm'd by the Pope, let them shew such: And then we say, Secondly, what if the decree of *Sixtus 5tus* was not promulg'd? was not this *Sixtus 5tus's* Edition? And it seems there was a decree for it, but not promulg'd, and the promulgation makes it but legible, the decree, I hope, makes it credible; the promulgation attends the binding of it in, *actu exercito*, but the

decree

decree attends the constitution of it, *in actu signato*. And was there no error in it because it was not promulgated? Or rather was not it therefore not promulgated because there was error in it?

Thirdly, the Authority of the Trent Council was ingaged rather for this than for that of Clement the 8th, for the Trent Council, (as they know) speaks of it as *in verbis de præsenti, hæc ipsa vetus & vulgata editio, quæ longo tot sæculorum usu, in ipsâ ecclesiâ probata est*, this very same old and vulgar edition, which by long use of so many ages is approved in the very Church, as if it had been so long before born, and now when it was of age, should be onely Christen'd.

Fourthly, How did *divers things creep in which needed a second review*? what, while the Church slept? then how can we believe the Church, in tradition and purity of Copies, for she may sleep while they are stolen or corrupted. Therefore have they no cause to triumph that Mr. *Chillingworth* hath said nothing to this point, in defence of Doctor *Potter*, as they say, in the following words. For if the Citation be right [Part 2.] Mr. *Chillingworth* did not publish, for ought I knew, what he had against the second part. And he gives an account thereof, why he did not, in the latter end of his Answer to the 2 part p. 390. And therfore they did not ingenuously charge him with this omission, since it was forborne in the whole, upon ingenious reasons. And if they thinke to save themselves because *Sixtus* his decree was not published: surely Mr. *Chillingworth* may be excused; because the second Part of his Answer was not published, However he had said enough against the perfection of the Vulgar translation in his answer to the first part 77. Even upon the opinion of their own men, *Lyranus*, *Cajetan*, *Pagnin*, *Arias*, *Erasmus*, *Valla*, *Steuchus*, who in many places have rejected it, and differed from it. And to these he adds the judgement of *Vega* (who was present at the Council

cil and was inſtructed therein by the Preſident of the Council, the Cardinal S. *Cruce*, as he ſaies) and of *Dredo*, and *Mariana*, who had the opinion of *Laines* in it, the General then of the ſociety, and in a ſort of *Bellarmine* alſo. But alſo if they might boaſt of not being anſwered in one point, then ſome body might boaſt that they have given Treaties for Anſwers. Laſtly, will they be confident that the decree was not publiſhed for the authority of the vulgar edition? why then doth it go under the name of *Sixtus 5tus*'s Bible? yea alſo Dr. *Iames*, who hath written *Bellum Papale* to ſuch a purpoſe, in his third part, 36. *p.* hath aſſerted that all the ſhifts they have made herein will not ſerve; *For both Bull and Bibles are in many mens hands*, whatſoever *Gretſer* ſaith to the Contrary.

This Paragraph might have been ſpared, and I might be excuſed ſurely for ſparing it; it gives me a former reaſon why my two places out of St. *Auſtin* are not anſwered, he tells *me that I have given him leave to have no more to do with the Fathers*. This is his reaſon, and my reaſon is, *becauſe he will have more to do than he can do to anſwer them*. We deny not a tryal by the Fathers though their Judgement be not infallible: and ſince we produce the Fathers for us, we are bound to anſwer them againſt us; as contrarily, if they produce them againſt us, they are bound to anſwer them againſt themſelves, and this is a rule of Reaſon, *Teſtem quem quis adducit pro ſe tenetur recipere contra ſe*, the witneſs which one brings for himſelf, he is bound to receive againſt himſelf. And therefore whatſoever *Coccius* ſaies *ad faciendum populum*; we may, I think ſay well as *Nilus* did in his firſt book of *Eccleſiaſtical* diſſentions, Πάνυ γ ἄτοπον τὰς μὲν πατέρας μὴ ἔχοντας παραδείγματα ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν ζητεῖν τὸ βέλτιον, ἡμᾶς γ ἐχόντας ἔχοντας μηδ' ὅτιοῦν ζητέιν. It is altogether abſurd that thoſe who have not the Fathers for their examples, ſhould of themſelves diſcern that which is better; and that we who have the Fathers ſhould not ſo neither underſtand. So he, of the

N. 37.

Romans alſo, ſo that my Adverſary ſhould not have ſtopt this gap, with an exception againſt my oppoſing of the Council of *Ariminum* to the *Nicene* Council towards proving the contradiction, and conſequently the fallibility of Councils, but this he hath nothing new to ſay againſt; and therefore I have nothing to anſwer more then formerly, onely he chides me becauſe I propoſed the Council of *Ariminum*, as if it had been a lawful Council, and ſo would *deceive the people which knoweth not which councils be lawful, which not*, No? This ſpoyles all, infallibility is in Councils, the people do not know which are right councils, and thoſe that are not right are not, and where then ſhall the people find their infallibility? where the way ſo plain *that Fooles cannot err*, as they have told us? It is better to be without a guide than to have one we cannot truſt. So we bid the Roman people good night, and take our leaves of this number.

N. 38. But this alſo makes number, it comes in in form of a tranſition, and ſo let it paſs.

N. 39. In this he begins to reſume his diſcourſe of ſuch particulars which are neceſſary to Salvation, and yet not plainly ſet down in Scripture. And the firſt inſtance is about the neceſſity of the not working upon the Sunday without any neceſſity. But to this and to the other inſtances of this kind, it would be ſufficient again to ſettle the ſtate of the queſtion; and it is thus, whether any thing neceſſary to ſalvation by neceſſity of mean, without the knowledge and belief whereof, in points of Faith, or without the knowledge and practiſe of in things of action we cannot come to ſalvation; is not with ſufficient plainneſs ſet down in Scripture: This is the ſtate of the queſtion which very few if any of his inſtances come near to; there may be as errors, ſo ſinnes, which are not clearly forbidden in Scripture: and therefore the ignorance of them will not damne where there is general repentance. And to hold and do any of theſe againſt our

our belief of the Truth therein, or duty, is acknowledged to be damnative without particular repentance; but this comes not up to the queſtion, whether there is no poſſibility of ſalvation without the belief of the truths and the practiſe of the duties, for ſo neither of us could be ſaved, unleſs there be any of us who knows all truths reduplicatively, and do all duties alſo.

And this might have ſatisfied my Adverſaries, for this and other examples; if it had became men pretending infalibility to receive any ſatisfaction but in victory.

But in particular, *You dare not ſay that he ſhall be ſaved who doth weekly work, and reſolveth to work upon the Sunday without any neceſſity.* And what then? Firſt let it be returned home, they dare not ſay that he ſhall be ſaved who reſolves to be abſent from high Maſs without neceſſity. The point betwixt us is, whether neceſſarily he muſt be damned who doth work upon the Sunday, not knowing whether it be ſuch a ſin; when they determine this, then we may determine by Scripture which part is to be held, whether it is deſtructive of Salvation or not. But Secondly, as to the neceſſity towards Salvation, the intimations of honour which are put upon the firſt day of the week and the practiſe of the Apoſtles is ſufficient to incline our practiſe on the ſafer hand, to wit, in the Negative; and if in contempt hereunto any ſhould reſolve to work without neceſſity, his caſe would be more dangerous: but the queſtion concerns not ſins in *ſubjecto* with all the circumſtances, but in *ſpecie*. Thirdly, as to the clear Text of the fourth Commandement, the determination of the day to the Jew was poſitive and Ceremonial, and therefore with other Jewiſh Ceremonies never to ceaſe, or if that alſo was morall, why do we not heare of it by their infallibility and practiſe? And if this had been intended for a caſe reſerved to make work for the authority of the Church, why was it not abſolutely determined in ſome general Council? The *Laodicean*

Council give not abſolute order, but under a condition, ὡς συμφέρει. Fourthly, Therefore to conclude this Number, whereas he ſaies I bring my own *Diſcourſes in ſtead of clear Texts*, let him bring either clear Text or clear diſcourſe for theſe two Propoſitions, 1. That this Point is abſolutely neceſſary to be known: And 2. That it is not clearly ſet down in Scripture, then we ſhall leave him in the field for this time: but if he will not anſwer to my Diſcourſes, becauſe they are *fallible*, he gives me leave to think more, and to ſay no more to his Diſcourſes upon the ſame account.

N. 40. In this Number he ſeems to be courteous, in receiving ſome ſatisfaction to my Anſwer about *things ſtrangled*. But it may be he thought himſelf bound to it upon the general ſuppoſition of the Romaniſt, that the Scripture was written but for particular occaſions, and to particular perſons: and therefore that Precept of the Apoſtles in the 15 of the *Acts* concerning the caſe, ſhould not upon their intention be alwaies binding. And yet I ſhall have nothing from him but I muſt pay for it: for he ſays, *Though we ſeek for Texts and not Reaſons*. But reaſon upon Principles of Scripture binds by vertue of the Principles. If not, how many of their Superſtructions muſt they diſcount. But let them give us Texts or Reaſons; and until they do ſo, we may have done with them.

N. 41. Shall we have either in the next, Whether the King be Head of the Church: This hath been ſufficiently ſpoken to before? what is new I ſhall touch upon. He ſaies, *This controverſie muſt highly import that all the Members may have an aſſured knowledge of the Head by whom they are to be governed*. To this we anſwer, Whatſoever is neceſſary in our ſenſe, highly imports: but, whatſoever highly imports, is not neceſſary in our ſenſe. Therefore, whereas he ſays afterwards, *Is not this a neceſſary point?* we deny it neceſſary in our ſenſe; for then God ſhould tie ſalvation to accidentals. It could not be neceſſary when

when and where there is no King, and this is to be numbred amongſt accidentals: but thoſe things which are abſolutely neceſſary, do not vary their nature upon contingencies.

But then as to the other Propoſition, which it is neceſſary for them to prove, namely, that this is not clearly enough delivered in Scripture, he ſays, reflecting upon our difference from our ſelves, as he ſuppoſeth, *this point was before evident Scripture, now it is no longer evident Scripture.* To this he brings in my Anſwer. Your Anſwer is firſt, *what is infallibly decided by Scripture, will ever be ſo, although we do not alwaies finde it.* To this he returns, If you mean what is *infallibly decided by Scripture evident, is not alwaies to be found, it is manifeſtly falſe,* &c. *Anſw.* If it be decided infallibly by Scripture evident in terms, that which he ſays is true: but who holds this point ſo evidently decided? If he means it infallibly decided by evident Scripture in way of conſequence, that which he ſays is *manifeſtly falſe,* is pertinent, but manifeſtly falſe. For how then could ſome Divines in the *Trent* Council aſſert many things to be decided by Principles of Scripture, which the adverſe party there could not finde? And why do they hold, that the Determinations of Councils are Prophetical, that ſo they may be infallible; if what is diſcourſed out of Principles could alwaies appear to all to be infallible? And why doth *Bellarmin* ſay in his 1. *b. de Baptiſmo, cap. 9. ad lit. B.* that the Baptiſm of Infants, *ſatis apertè colligitur ex Scripturis, ut ſupra oſtendimus,* the Baptiſm of Infants is clearly enough gathered out of Scriptures, as we have ſhewed before: although if my Adverſaries were upon the Jury for this controverſie they would bring in an *Ignoramus.*

Then he comes to my ſecond Anſwer. *You adde ſecondly, That you do not ſay every point is infallibly decided by Scripture, becauſe it is not at all decided.* Well, and what to this? *Sir, is not this a neceſſary point? Anſw.*

And

And is not this, in another mans expreſſion, to be a begger of the queſtion? Let them prove it to be neceſſary: but it ſeems rather by them, that it is not neceſſary. For ſince the Scripture doth not clearly decide it, as they ſuppoſe, therefore the Church ſhould, becauſe otherwiſe it will be wanting in things neceſſary where the Scripture doth not determine. Now if the Church hath determined for the laſt three of the firſt ſix hundred years, it hath determined againſt the Pope for Kings (not as we take them to be Heads of the Church, as they take the Pope to be *Head*, but) as Supreme Governours *circa Sacra*. And ſo the Church for that ſpace, which is moſt conſiderable in this buſineſs, is againſt the Popes being Head of the Church, and the Scripture doth not declare it for him, as my Adverſaries confeſs; for then it ſhould declare by conſequent negatively againſt Kings (as I have ſaid before) and therefore, upon the whole matter, they have nothing for the Popes being Head. And then again, if the Scripture hath not declared for the Pope, it muſt be declarative ſufficiently for the King; becauſe no other pretends to be competitor; and this is their own argumentation. The Church muſt be infallible, no other Church pretends to infallibility but theirs; therefore ſo Government of the Church muſt be. The Scripture ſpeaks of Government; they dare not ſay that the Scripture declares for the Pope; therefore, it muſt declare for Kings. Or, ſince all agreement is reſolved into common Principles, let this difference be mediated by theſe four Propoſitions.

1. Government of the Church is neceſſary.

2. This Government muſt be in the Pope or the King.

3. The Scripture doth not declare for the Pope.

4. The Scripture declares all Points neceſſary; therefore it declares for the King. The three firſt Propoſitions they conſent to. And the fourth is not yet diſproved; therefore

This

This Paragraph is a ſupernumerary. To make ſhort work, we have no need of repetitions. But he will urge again S. *Matthews* Goſpel, and again tax me for holding it *no point of neceſſity to believe* that it was S. *Matthews*. This, he ſaies my *learned Brethren in Ratisbon* durſt not ſay. *Plato*'s rule is good, οὐ τὶς ἀλλ' τί, not ſo much who ſpeaks, as what; yet this is neceſſary for us to believe, that it was written by one inſpired, indefinitely. But it is not equally neceſſary for me to believe by whom: for then I cannot believe the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, becauſe I cannot certainly believe it was written by Saint *Paul*. Again, my learned Brethren dared not deny it to be an Article of Faith. But firſt an Article of Faith may be taken largely for whatſoever is to be believed. Now though all Articles of Faith in a ſpecial ſenſe are to be believed: yet all that is to be believed, is not in the ſenſe of the queſtion, an Article of Faith. But then ſecondly, Not to dare to deny it, is not to affirm it. One is a negative act: the other a poſitive. But a *pari*, if I muſt be bound to their opinion, why is not my Adverſary bound to his learned Brethren in *Ratisbon*, who did not ſtate infallibilities as my Adverſaries do, with the neceſſity of a Council? And why do my Adverſaries differ from *Bellarmin*, and others of their Brethren, who will be *ſcandalized* by them, becauſe they diſpute the Popes being Head of the Church from Scripture? for they would be loth to want the Authority of the Scripture for ſo *capital a point*, which concerns not *many millions* onely (as the other, and therefore it ſeems not abſolutely neceſſary, becauſe then it would concern abſolutely all) but even all: for in *Bellarmin*'s opinion, as in his Catechiſm, a Chriſtian is defined by union to the Church under the Pope, as Head thereof. N. 42.

As for his provoking me to believe the Goſpel of Saint *Matthew* upon account of the Church, in this number alio, by the Authority of S. *Auſtin*; I ſay onely, he might have been

been ſo modeſt as to have left this out until he had anſwered me in what I have ſaid to that Teſtimony of Saint *Auſtin* at large before.

N. 43. Here he runs mightily upon a miſtake, for what I ſpoke by way of ſuppoſition, he conſtrues Categorically. I ſaid, we might ſuppoſe more aſſiſtance (not aſſurance) to the Church in commending Books Canonical, than in other caſes. He takes me to have ſpoken poſitively, as if God had given infallibility to the Church in this matter, though in none other; and therefore we are obliged to believe the Church in this abſolutely. Whereas what I ſaid comes to no more than what is uſually ſaid upon ſuch caſes, *dato non conceſſo*. And do not the Schoolmen diſpute upon hypothetical queſtions? As if I ſhould ſay, If the Pope were infallible in perſon, what need would there be of a Council? Or, if my Adverſaries had a minde to be contented with common Principles of Chriſtianity, we ſhould ſoon have done. Theſe Conſequences are upon meer ſuppoſitions. So, if we were bound to receive the Canonical Books from the Church, we might ſuppoſe more aſſiſtance as to this than to other Points. Doth this affirm that the Church had infallible Aſſiſtance herein, and that we were to take the Books ultimately upon the Authority of the Church? Again, if we were to take the Books upon the account of the Church, what is this to the Roman Church? Is not the Univerſal Church of all times and places more credible than the Roman? The whole bears them, not they the whole. Nay, when he had abuſed my Suppoſition in *p.* 86. he doth acknowledge that I do not make belief of Scripture to depend upon the Authority of the Church.

So then my Adverſary needs not to triumph and ſay, *This ſpoils all, your onely ſhift*, &c. He runs away with the line, but he will be hooked as well. My Adverſary hath granted me, that the Scripture may be ſaid to contain

contain all things neceſſary, becauſe it ſendeth us to the Church, where we may have them. And may not I as well ſay to this, that *this ſpoils all?* may I not return him the fruit of his Diſcourſe, *mutatis mutandis?* Will he grant that we have direction to the Church from Scripture? Then the onely ſhift they have to avoid our Poſition of the Scriptures containing all things neceſſary, is *ſtill to ſay* that the Scripture ſends us to the Church. *And will* they *now ſuppoſe this moſt neceſſary point of all points, which is not clearly ſet down in Scripture to be admitted with infallible aſſent, upon the onely Authority* of the Scripture? *That we are univerſally to hear the Scripture,* in things neceſſary to ſalvation, *we have many pregnant places in Scripture,* as hath been ſhewed: *but that we are to learn this one point, and none but this, from the infallible Authority of Scripture, hath no colour or ſhadow of Scripture, or any thing like Scripture. You muſt therefore ground your faith not upon Scripture but upon Reaſon. Now the reaſon upon which you reject* the Scripture, is, becauſe you have a neceſſity of an external infallible Judge ever *ſince the whole Canon was finiſhed. And for this onely reaſon* (*without any Text,*) *you put* the Scriptures ſufficiency *to expire and give up the ghoſt* even after the finiſhing *of the Canon. Now if the reaſon for which you diſcard* the Scriptures ſufficiency, *be this, becauſe all points* are not *ſufficiently cleared by Scripture, then there can be no other prudent reaſon for which you in this one point may ſuppoſe the* Scripture to be ſufficient *than this, that that one point* (namely, that we are to repair to the Church for all things neceſſary to ſalvation) cannot be infallibly aſcertain'd by the Church. And *therfore there is a greater neceſſity to have recourſe* to the ſufficiency of Scripture *undoubtedly infallible* in all points, which doth not *cauſally bring forth* their opinion of the Church. Let me put them to it. Doth the Scripture bring forth their opinion of the Church, or doth it not. If it doth not: what hold have they for the Church? And why do they make

uſe of the Scripture to give Letters of Credence to the Church? If it doth, then there is an end of this Controverſie.

Now the *two inferences* he would have me mark as clearly deduced *from my principles*, are grounded but upon a ſuppoſition: and therefore not to be marked, but returned upon his conceſſion; Firſt, *That all points neceſſary are plainly ſet down in Scripture: for no point more neceſſary than this, without which there is no coming to the belief of any thing* in the Church: *and yet this point is not plainly ſet down in Scripture*; nor that the Church is infallible, *obſcurely*. Yea, whereas he ſaies the Scripture ſends us to the Church: the Univerſal Church doth ſend us to the infallible Scripture for our neceſſary direction. And this would give them ſatisfaction, if it could ſerve their turn.

Moreover, the ſecond thing which he would have me mark, halts upon the ſame unequal ground, of ſuppoſing me to affirm what was but ſuppoſed. Yet alſo we can ſend it home again: and I can ſay that their former conceſſion, ſpoken of before, *doth overthrow that principle which is the ground-work of* their *faith. For if there be a greater neceſſity to acknowledge* the direction of Scripture in things neceſſary *for as much as concerns this one point of the Church, becauſe this one point in particular is leſs clear* of it ſelf, *that grand principle* of theirs (which is or muſt be their principle) *evidently appeareth falſe*; namely that the Teſtimony of the Church is evidently ſeen *by its own light*; which muſt be, or elſe they are all undone. And again, *how is it poſſible that there ſhould be a greater neceſſity on the one ſide to have recourſe* to the Scripture for the infallible direction of the Church, becauſe it cannot be proved infallible by it ſelf; and *yet on the other ſide*, this *point of all other points hath this particular priviledge to be ſo manifeſt, that it beareth witneſs of it ſelf, that it carrieth its own light with it*. So they may ſee what they get by taking

king a ſuppoſition for an Affirmation. *Tacitus*'s rule is good; let nothing be thought proſperous which is not ingenuous. Some other lines he hath in this Section, to tell me what he hath done before; and I have undone.

But as to a paſſage which I uſed out of *Bellarmine* to confirm a Dilemma (which he tells me here that he hath broken before, leſt the contrary ſhould have been better diſcerned upon the place) he referred me to *Bellarmin*, *l.*1. *c.*1. In fine, as much as I can reade the hand, I made uſe of *Bellarmin* againſt new Revelations beſide Scripture: and therefore we cannot believe the Church for it ſelf; becauſe we cannot believe it but by a Revelation, and no Revelation beſide Scripture, as he diſputes againſt the Anabaptiſts. For my anſwer he puts me off to the former place, I think, in the end. And there is little to the buſineſs. He ſaies indeed in the end, "That "we do receive the Prophetical and Apoſtolical Books "according to the minde of the Catholick Church, as "of old it is laid out in the Council of *Carthage* and the "Council of *Trent*, to be the Word of God, *Et certam* "*ac ſtabilem regulam fidei*, and the certain and ſtable rule "of faith. Now I hope theſe latter words are for us. For if theſe words be taken in their juſt and full ſenſe, then the cauſe is ours. If the Scripture be the certain and ſtable rule of faith, then it muſt be clear, otherwiſe how is it a certain rule? and therefore no need of an infallible Judge. And it muſt be ſufficient alwaies; otherwiſe how is it a ſtable rule? and ſo it excludes Traditions.

But ſure that is not the Chapter, becauſe my Adverſary ſaies, *in that place where he ſpeaketh of the Maccabees in particular*, which he doth not ſpeak of in the firſt. That Chapter where he particularly ſpeaks of the *Maccabees* is the fifteenth: but there is nothing to the purpoſe neither. Thus he puts me to the hunt leſt he ſhould be at a loſs. Well but ἐυρήκαμεν, it is ſurely in the tenth

Chapter, where at the end, he anſwers, as my Adverſary doth, to S. *Ieroms* Authority againſt the Booke of *Maccabees*: But this is beſides the Butt. For that which I looked for to be anſwered out of *Bellarmin*, was the other point of no revelarion beſide Scripture. It is true that I did in the ſame place name *Bellarmine* as relating S. *Ieroms* differing from my Adverſarie about the Book of the *Maccabees*: But why ſhould I expect an anſwer to *Bellarmine* in this teſtimony, when he produceth it onely that he might refute it? that which I ſhould have had ſatisfaction in out of *Bellarmine* was ſpoken by him out of his own judgement. But again, why did not my Adverſary ſave me the labour of looking up and down for the paſſage by giving me the entire words of the Cardinal there? I might have thought my Adverſary would have been νὸς Ἀχιλλεύς, and he proves rather πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς. For he thought it was not requiſite that I ſhould finde the place becauſe there are ſome adjacent words which I can improve: He ſaies *Ierome* was of that opinion, *quia nondum Generale Concilium de his libris aliquid ſtatuerat, excepto Libro* Judith, *quem etiam* Hieronymus *poſtea recepit*. Mark the words; "Becauſe the General Council "had not yet determined any thing of thoſe Books, ex- "cept the Book of *Iudith*, which alſo afterwards S. *Ie*- "*rome* received. So then it ſeems a General Council had before taken theſe Books into conſideration (namely that of *Toby* and *Iudith*, and of the *Maccabees*) and determined nothing but for *Iudith*. Then one of the Councils muſt erre: either that which eſtabliſhed *Iudith* and not the reſt: or that which eſtabliſhed *Iudith* and the reſt, namely that of *Carthage*, wihch my Adverſary ſaies S. *Ierome* had not ſeen. One thought them not fit to be declared Canonical: another thought them to be fit. And is not this a contradiction of Council to Council. Again *Bellarmine* ſaies that S. *Ierome* did afterwards receive the Book of *Iudith*. Now I deſire to know how much time that

that [*after*] doth ſuppoſe for. If S. *Ierome* had received it preſently, we ſhould have heard of it; if much time after, as it might be by the words, then the Authority of the Church ſeemed not to S. *Ierome* ſo intuitively to oblige, as the Antagoniſts ſuppoſe. Had he thought the Church infallible, would he have ſtuck at it? Do not the Romaniſts know the rule in *Tacitus*, *Qui deliberant deſciverunt*, They which deliberate have already revolted.

What he would have me note by the way, that the Fathers of the Council of *Carthage* did acknowledge the *Maccabees* for true Scripture, it is no difficult matter to give account to. For firſt, he goes upon a falſe Principle, that *if thoſe Fathers were of our Religion, then we muſt make them agree with* us *in this prime Principle upon which we receive all Scripture as Gods infallible word*. This is not ſo: for my living Adverſaries may know that one who hath defended our Religion hath been quoted to me as differing from me in this point; and that is Mr. *Chillingworth*. Though all that are of this opinion are like to be of our Religion: yet all of our Religion, it ſeems, are not of this opinion. For indeed the Proteſtant Religion ſuppoſeth the Scripture to be the Word of God, as a common Principle: and therefore alſo there ſhould not have been any conteſtation about this point, if our Adverſaries had not been reſolved to queſtion all Religion which is not properly theirs. Secondly, Therefore they might have received Scripture upon the Authority of Univerſal Tradition; which alſo abſtracts from the Roman Impropriation. Thirdly, Since they had not Univerſal Tradition for thoſe Apochryphal Bookes, as it ſeems by S. *Ierom*, we cannot neither upon that account be ingaged to receive them as Canonical. Fourthly, Since they did not receive them by Univerſal Tradition, as appears alſo by *Cyril* of *Ieruſalem*, as before; and ſince they are not to be diſcerned by their own light, as my Adverſaries

ries will confeſs, not by the conditions of the matter, what reaſon ſhall we have to receive them? For if they ſay, the Council was aſſiſted by the Holy Ghoſt: we ask, what? was it aſſiſted as a Council, or as ſuch a Council? if as a Council, why had not the other the ſame Aſſiſtance? if as ſuch a Council, how ſhall we diſcern which Council the Holy Ghoſt will aſſiſt unto infallibility?

*-----Et ſolos credit habendos*
*Eſſe Deos quos ipſe colit-----*

N. 45. In this he is pleaſed to move again the ſame ſtone, which will in the end return upon himſelf again. For how came one Council to acknowledge the *Maccabees*, and another not? were not the former Council as well *irradiated* as the latter? Yes, they were more in all account but of my Adverſary, who is not in ſo good a capacity to grant that the Argument from Authority of the Church graduates its ſtrength by the greater nearneſs to the Primitive. For, he holds an equal aſſiſtance of the Spirit to the Church at all times. But the old ſaying was, *Quò antiquius eò melius.* And the rule is good, *Ut ſe habet ſimpliciter ad ſimpliciter, ita magis ad magis & maximè ad maximè*, if it be good as ancient, then the more ancient the more good. And this at other times is the advantage which the Romaniſts would take, in claiming the credit of the Original Church to them. And beſides, he might have conſidered that he had no reaſon to bring this about again, becauſe the reaſon of their reception, as was ſaid before, is expreſſed to depend upon the cuſtome of their being read in the Church: which doth not make them or declare them to be Canonical unles in S. *Ieroms* diſtinction, for the edifying of the people in manners, not for confirmation of faith. Well then, if one Council might *ſee* what another did not without prejudice to the object, then S. *Ierome* might not ſee, or *Luther*, what S. *Auſtin* did, without prejudice to the credibility of Scripture. Yea, it is not yet proved that

S. *Auſtin*

S. *Auſtin* accounted the Book of *Maccabees* as Canonical as other Books. But this is *actum agere*. And again he repeats what he hath not done. Let them not trouble us, for they have loſt their ſtrength.

And yet again S. *Matthews* Goſpel. He had better have ſolidly proved, which he ſleightly puts off the proof of, in the end of the laſt ſection, that they do not *prove the infallibility of the Church firſt by Scripture*. I aſſure them this is a Fort-royal: and therefore this ſhould be made good at all hands. N. 46.

Well but let us ſee his *Argument* in the face, about S. *Matthews* Goſpel: which he ſaies *he hath forced a paſſage to*. Surely he had no ſuch reaſon to rally and obtrude this Argument again, and to be ſo confident of it, as to *ſay boldly* that it *cannot poſſibly by* our *Principles ever come to be believed with an infallible aſſent to be Gods true uncorrupted word*. Why not? Nay here is all of this, no proof. We looked for a Spear like a Weavers Beam, or elſe ſome new Sword, whereby the *Philiſtin* thought to have ſlain *David*: but here is none yet. Yea *Stapleton* ſhall ſufficiently anſwer him with a contradiction, as before, who ſaies, It is not abſolutely neceſſary to Faith that it ſhould be produced by the Authority of the Church; but it may be cauſed immediately by the Spirit of God. So then it is poſſible by our Principles to believe it with an infallible aſſent to be the Word of God. And before a Church was formed, how did the material Members believe any point of Faith? then it is poſſible.

But then he ſlides to another way, as he thought, of urging his Argument; and that is, *the Marcionites, the Cerdoniſts*, and *the Manichæans do deny* (*and others may come to deny*) *the Goſpel of S.* Matthew *to be Gods true Word*. Yea, but this is another queſtion. It is one thing to believe it to be Gods Word; and another to prove it to him that denies it to be Gods Word. Now the queſtion in hand is how we believe it to be Gods Word. And therefore

therefore we ſay, as to ſuch, we deal with them as we deal with others who deny any part of Scripture, not by the Authority of the Roman Church (and therefore the Romaniſts get nothing by this Argument) but by Univerſal Tradition, as a common Argument; which rather makes a Scholaſtical Faith, than a Faith Divine, of proper name. So that alſo he cannot reaſonably put me in minde again that I cannot credit it to be the Word of God by virtue of the Tranſlation: ſince according to my opinion, *Tranſlations are onely ſo far Gods Word as they agree with the Originals: but we have onely Tranſlations of S.* Matthews *Goſpel, no Original at all.* This we have in places before ſpoken to. But ſuppoſe no Original Copie of Saint *Matthews* Goſpel: yet this makes no impoſſibility of belief in *Stapletons* judgement, becauſe we may believe immediately without the interpoſal of the Church. And the Tranſlation is conſiderable as an Inſtrument to repreſent the Object, not to help the Effect: it hath more relation to the *fides quæ*, than the *fides quâ*, to the Faith objective rather than the Faith ſubjective. So that I do not believe the ſenſe to be true for the Tranſlation: but *I beleve* the Tranſlation true becauſe it agrees with the Senſe. And he that made the Originall can Supply it. Again, they belive the Goſpel of St *Matthew*. Do they not? how do they believe it? by the authority of the Church. Well, but what authority had the Church either operative or declarative, to make or declare that to be Scripture which was not Scripture? they ſay then, the Church can make tranſlations, and particularly the vulgar latin to be authentique, but the vulgar is not abſolutely authentique by confeſſion of their own men. And beſides the beſt reaſon which could be, had it been true of the vulgar, was this, that that ſhould be authentique, becauſe it was made by the original copies before they were corrupted. Yea, but my adverſaries ſay, there was no original copie of St. *Matthews* Goſpel: or if there was

they

they are worthy to die, as *David* ſaid of *Abner* becauſe they have kept their Maſter no better. Are they now the Church unto which *perfidia non poteſt habere acceſſum*, no unfaithfulneſs can have acceſs? Again, if there was not an original copie or no copie of the original, how ſhall we believe their Church to be infallible, ſince the chief place of ſtrength for their Church is found in that Goſpel, 16. *Ch.* 18. as *Perron* would think. Suppoſe the queſtion then be made how they prove their infallibility by Scripture: anſwer is made, by the 16. of St. *Matt.* the 18. Well but we muſt know it firſt to be the word of God before they prove their Church infallible by it. Now they are at as great a loſs as we, for they cannot prove that Text to be the word of God by the infallibility of the Church, becauſe the infallibility of the Church is in queſtion, if that be not before hand aſſured to us that it is the word of God. If then at length they have a mind to reſt themſelves in common argumentative principles, and reſolve their perſwaſion of it to be the word of God upon the credit of univerſal tradition; ſo do we, as to this kind of perſwaſion.

Whereas then they ſay, *It is uncertain who the Tranſlator was, and of what skill and honeſty*, we anſwer, this makes more againſt them. For if a Divine Faith be neceſſary, as they mightily aſſert, then it is reaſon that we ſhould leſs relie upon humane arguments, which make but humane faith: and therefore for our private aſſurance, ſhould believe it upon Gods own authority.

To that they ſay, *If there were one Hebrew Copie*, then (in St. *Ierom's* time) *what is that to our purpoſe now*? I anſwer firſt, that this may abate their confidence of an abſolute negative. 2. If thoſe of *Berea* did gratifie St. *Ierom* with the uſe of that Hebrew Copy, it is very probable that as the former *Bereans* were diligent in ſearching the Scriptures whether thoſe things ſpoken by St. *Paul* were true, ſo thoſe would take care to conſign it to

posterity, if there was but that one copie thereof. 3. If he had the liberty by the *Nazaraans* to describe it (as before) then surely of that Autograph, St. *Ierome* would have made an Apograph, he would have made another copy. And 4. If the translation they so much brag of were his, they know *what skill and honesty* the Translator was of. So then they are brought to this either to take my answer, or to deny their translation, which they will. And *all* their *shifts will not help them.*

N. 47. Here he would put me out of my shifts, as he calls them. I asked them, how they were sure of their latin interpretation to be authentique: they say now *by tradition of former ages*. Well, but we are satisfied thus also by way of argument concerning the Scriptures and in particular concerning the Gospel of St. *Matthew*. We say also that we are infallibly satisfied herein by the Spirit of God. And this way of faith I hope we may assert. we may believe what we cannot prove; as they believe that Roman Faith which they cannot prove.

But he saies we are incapacitated to make use of tradition, *This tradition doth not certifie you, because you hold it fallible.* So then: *Credo quod habes & habes*, Is this a sufficient argumentation? And so consequently, it is infallible to you, because you hold it infallible. So it must it seems be. You do not hold it because it is infallible: but it is infallible because you hold it. And thus infallibility shall not make faith: but opinion shall make infallibility. I had thought before, that verity had been fundamentally in things, and that things had not been true because we conceive them so, but our conceits had been true because things are so. Surely it is a better argument that the Roman Faith cannot be certified to them, because their principles are uncertain, as hath been shewed, then that *tradition cannot certifie us, because we hold it fallible.* If it be infallible, we are as sure as they, in the certitude of the object; though because we think it falli-

ble

ble, we are not certain *certitudine ſubjecti*, in the certitude of the ſubject, *valeat quantum valere poteſt*. And why would they have us ſure of our faith in the certainty of the ſubject, and yet ſcarce allow a certainty of ſalvation in the certitude of the object? But then 2. They are ſure by the *tradition of former ages*, namely univerſal tradition they mean, do they not? if ſo univerſal tradition includes all places, then how comes infallibility to be the prerogative of their Church, when they are to prove their faith by univerſal tradition. 3. It ſeems they do not hold tradition to be infallible (and therefore by their own argument, it cannot certifie them) ſince that which was held in the Church univerſally for the firſt ages, they do not now hold, as they have been told, namely the millenary opinion, infant communion, ſtanding up in prayer from *Eaſter* to *whitſuntide*. Yea why do they not ſtand up altogether at prayer as was appointed by a Council? Ἐστὼτας δόξει τῇ Ἁγίᾳ Συνόδῳ πάσιν ἐν κυριακαῖς τὰς εὐχὰς ποιεῖσθαι τῷ Θεῷ. 4. If they mean the terme [certifie] as infallibly, we grant it: if they mean it morally, we deny it: and therefore if they have no more certainty then of tradition for their faith, they have no faith of proper name. 5. We are upon the ſurer ground to truſt upon the Scripture, becauſe the Church muſt be ſubordinate to it, then they, becauſe they truſt to the Church for the truth of Scripture. For if this were right then the Church might have that priviledge, which St. *Paul* could not claim to himſelf, namely to be miſtreſs of our faith: whereas St. *Paul* denies it 2. Ep. *Cor.* 1. 24. Not as Maſters of your Faith, but helpers of your joy. And we have *Eſtius* alſo of our opinion, as before, that all faith hath not the authority of the Church for the formal reaſon thereof, this is enough againſt his firſt ſhift, *the ſecond ſhift is, this Goſpel might poſſibly at the firſt be written in Greek*, and here he asks me *whether poſſibilities grounded upon conjectures be ſufficient to ground an infallible aſſent.*

We anſwer, no, but exceptions of a poſſibility of error are ſufficient to contradict infallibility. They ſay they have an infallible faith; we ſay there is a poſſibility of error herein: and this is enough for us againſt them. And then 2. This weapon we uſe againſt you, *Poſſibilities grounded upon conjectures* are not *ſufficient to ground an infallible aſſent*: This it ſeems is their own poſition, now they have nothing but poſſibilities for them; therefore they have no infallible aſſent. This aſſumption hath been proved before upon their own principles. We have nothing but poſſibilities grounded upon conjectures, that they have a right Pope, legitimate in his Baptiſme and prieſthood; and ſo of other Prieſts, there might be want of due matter, due form, due intention; which with them make the act null.

But then he compares the inevidence of St. *Matthews* Goſpel to be the *uncorrupted word of God*, with the evidence of St. *Lukes* Goſpel to be ſuch by its own light, and would have me think as much reaſon to believe the inevidence of the latter, as I doe of the former, but 1. he doth not rightly to compare the evidence of St. *Lukes* Goſpel with the inevidence of St. *Matthew's* as he would have me graunt. As if becauſe I ſuppoſed an inevidence which was the original, I alſo graunted an inevidence of the Goſpel, and yet faith doth not exclude a negative inevidence, there may be certitude of aſſent without evidence of the object, therefore we ſay 2. We are rather aſſured of the language by the Scripture, then of the Scripture by the language, otherwiſe the ignorant people could have no faith of Scripture. 3. We can give, upon our own principles, as much credit to the Church (as to the point of the originall language) as the Church can require or they prove. 4. How did the Church firſt accept it to be the word of God, whether the Greek was the originall or not. By the internall teſtimonie of the ſpirit, it muſt be ſaid. For if it ſhould be ſaid we

receive

receive now by tradition of former ages, this is forecluded, becauſe we ask the queſtion how the firſt Church accepted it, if not by the ſpirit of God internally aſſuring them, then let them tell us how they came to the faith thereof, not opinion: if ſo, then why may we not receive it ſo too. And moreover, it doth not follow that if the Goſpel of St. *Matthew* were originally greek, therefore we ſhould ſee it to be ſo as well as St. *Luke*? *A poſſe ad eſſe non valet. Multa videntur quæ non ſunt: multa ſunt quæ non videntur.* Many things ſeem which are not: many things are which are not ſeen. Every *irradiated underſtanding* of theirs doth not ſee all points which belong to their Church. Some do ſee the Monarchie of the Church to be as *Bellarmin*: ſome do not ſee the Monarchy of the Church, as *Spalatenſis* notes. Again, how came it to paſs that the former Churches did not ſee the Apocryphal books to be Gods true and uncorrupted word: and yet ſome Church of later times hath ſeen them? ſuch anſwers of mine would be repetitions; were they not anſwers to his repetitions.

Nextly he comes to my argument (which I did not make much of, but he leſs) that the Goſpel of St. *Matt.* was written in Greek, *becauſe the Greek copie doth interpret the word* Immanuel, *which if it were written in Hebrew, needed not any interpretation.* But my Adverſary might have added, if he had pleaſed, that which followes in my Paper [ſince the letters of the word put together without any variation do make that ſignification] And this we called not a demonſtration, nor a probability, but rather a poſſibility by that reaſon. And therefore unleſs he did make all things invincible by infallibility, he needed not to have called it a *pitiful weak conjecture.* Well, but what ſaid he? Μάντις δεῖσθαι ὅτις εἰκάζει καλῶς.

He anſwers then, *it is manifeſt that tranſlations of Scripture uſually tell us the Hebrew word firſt, and then the tranſlation of it,* ſo Gen. Bi. 48. Galaad *id eſt tumulus teſtis.*

Not

Not to take any notice of the Scribe; he puts here that in the way of interpretation, which is there delivered in way of a cauſe, and reaſon of the terme. Ver. 47. but *Iacob* called it *Galeed*; then 48. for *Laban* ſaid this heap is witneſs between me and thee this day, therefore he called the name of it *Galeed*. And before the name which *Laban* gave it in *Chaldee*, *Segar Sahudatha*, is not there interpreted, although there be a little difference between that and the name which *Iacob* gave it in Hebrew: for *Galeed* ſignifies the heap of witnes, the other heap his witnes. Therefore whereas he would make [*Galaad*, *id eſt tumulus teſtis*] to be in termes Scripture, it is not ſo. No more is that of *Exodus* 12. *Phaſe id eſt tranſitus*. It is not ſaid ſo there, but there is a reaſon given why they ſhould eat it in haſte, for it is the Lords Paſſeover, ver. 11. the reaſon is given before, which is contrary to what he ſaies, *that it is uſual to put the Hebrew words firſt, and then the tranſlation of it*: but here is the reaſon before, and no formal interpretation. *Ratio nominis*, I hope, is different from an interpretation. Another inſtance (and indeed in order before the laſt) is *Gen.* 35. 18. *Benoni i.e. filius doloris mei*, Benjamin *id filius dextræ*. But here alſo he preſumptuouſly ſuppoſeth his vulgar latin to be Scripture, which is to ſuppoſe that which is not to be ſuppoſed; and indeed a ſophiſm in begging that which is in queſtion: none of all languages which the great Bible ſet out with us hath, doth put in theſe words in form of an expoſition. The Syriack and the Arabick and the Greek doe expreſs the matter of the interpretation; but then they leave out the name *Benoni*: but all keep *Benjamin* without any interpretation. Another inſtance of his is *Exod.* 16. 15, 31. *Manna quod ſignificat quid eſt hoc*. And here again he takes the vulgar Latin for good Scripture: for none give the terme and afterwards the ſignification but the Latin: but the name *Manna* they do not name. And whether that be the ſignification of *Manna* deſerves a criticiſm. Some think

that

that it may come from the Hebrew נחל; and so it should signifie a portion; neither is *Bethel* interpreted upon the place, *Gen.*35.15.

So then, upon the whole matter, that which he confidently saies being not so in his own Instances and more, my conjecture is yet true and good; unless they can make the Latine Translation to be as Catholique Scripture as they would have the Pope to be universal Bishop. And surely if a Translator of Scripture doth translate words of Scripture (where the words are not interpreted in Scripture) he is not a Translator of Scripture, *quoad hoc*, formally, but materially of that which is Scripture. And this is not to render Scripture so much as to make it. And moreover they may know this to be the usage of the Evangelists besides (which are acknowledged to have written originally in Greek) to give the Interpretation of the Hebrew or Syriack words. My conjecture then is well recovered of its weakness.

But then he falls upon me for giving a contradiction to S. *Ierom. Though he saith he did see a copie of the Hebrew Original with his own eyes: you reject him though all the Fathers writings extant stand on his side.*

*Answ.* A conjecture of a possibility of the contrary makes no such contradiction which stands betwixt affirmation and negation categorically. 2. S. *Ierom* then hath rather contradicted them, if a conjecture be sufficient to a contradiction. For can we conceive that there is not room enough for a conjecture, that either that Copie which S. *Ierom* had use of, or that which he described (which may be as certain as some other) may now be extant in the world; which contradicts my Adversary. 3. If there were an Hebrew Copie, it is more than a conjecture, it is more than probable that he who translated it into Greek, did exactly compare it with the Hebrew, whose faithfulness, in those times, we might better trust than some Romans now. And also they know that the

the Pope may be deceived in point of fact. Neither did all the Fathers, I ſuppoſe, ſee the Hebrew Copie. And it would have been enough, that none of the Fathers are againſt it: but it is a greater adventure to ſay, all the Fathers ſtand on that ſide. And alſo they may know what Father did profeſs that he did ſee the remainers of thoſe cells, in which the *Seventy* did tranſlate the Old Teſtament, and who contemns that teſtimony. I think I bear as much reſpect to the Fathers, as ſome of the *Romaniſts* do, or more: but yet if I ſhould hold with the *Romans* againſt the Fathers that the Biſhop of *Rome* was the univerſal Biſhop, I ſhould not be blamed for contradicting the Fathers.

But to his Argument, *This Copie tranſlateth*, ergo, *it is a tranſlation. Anſw.* The Antecedent begs the queſtion, whether it doth tranſlate or not. Whatſoever doth interpret doth not tranſlate. And therefore here is an Argument for me, It doth not tranſlate, *ergo*, it is not a Tranſlation. And it doth not tranſlate: for then the Interpretation muſt be in the Hebrew, which is denied to have been the uſe of the *Hebrews*, as before; eſpecially in the ſame caſe, where the name is given in the ſame letters which ſignifie the interpretation. Therefore the Latine doth not tranſlate, when it giveth the Interpretation, as in the former examples. And the other Evangeliſts are not Tranſlators, when they interpret Hebrew or Syriack words. So his Argument is for me. And ſo my *cauſe* is not *loſt*, as to this point: ſince alſo S. *Auſtin* profeſſed in that of his againſt the Epiſtle of the *Manichean*, that he would hear Reaſon againſt *Antiquity*: at leaſt ſurely he might do ſo in matter of fact.

*Your third ſhift is in place of giving anſwer to make an objection, asking why our Latine Tranſlation was made authentique, if the Church had made the Greek authentique. Anſw.* Shall I ſay that my Adverſary doth not ſeem here to know well what ſhift to make: ſince he carps at my

anſwering

anſwering by way of queſtion? But then they ſhould be better adviſed than to make ſuch Arguments as they will not be willing to anſwer an intergatory about in the ſame matter. But he ſaies (paſſing by ſome other words which ſeem too hot for him) *I know of no body who told you that the Greek Tranſlation was made authentique by the Church.* I return upon him. Was the Greek Tranſlation made authentique or not? He is not willing to ſay it was nor it was not. But I preſs them. Was it? or was it not? If it was not, then their Tranſlation was not of authentique Scripture: and ſo, again, they do not tranſlate but make Scripture. If it was made authentique by the Church, then what need of two authentique Tranſlations? Again, if it were not made authentique by the Church, then the Church could be without the authentique Goſpel of Saint *Matthew*, and yet have enough for ſalvation: and therefore can we be as well without Traditions of the Church, becauſe I preſume they profeſs ſo much reverence to the Goſpel of S. *Matthew*, that they will not ſay that Traditions are more neceſſary than the Goſpel of S. *Matthew*. And if it were made authentique abſolutely by the Church: we can better believe it by the vertue of Univerſal Tradition, than they can believe their Latine by the authority of the Roman Church. And if it be neceſſary, as it is, that Tranſlations, as ſuch, *ſhould agree with Originals*, and the queſtion be which is the Original, or where the Original is to be found, they are in as great difficulty as we: for then they have no certainty of an Original, as to this Goſpel, to make uſe of for their Tranſlation. And if their Latine, as to this, was a Tranſlation of a Tranſlation: we have the better cauſe in this, becauſe we truſt rather to the firſt Tranſlation. And if ſome part of the Church made uſe of the Septuagints Tranſlation in ſtead of the Hebrew, and the Pen-men of the New Teſtament made ſo much uſe of it alſo, as is confeſſed by learned men; then may we rather make uſe

of the Gospel of Saint *Matthew* in Greek than they in Latine.

*Your fourth shift is to pretend to this knowledge by the harmony with other Gospels.* Ans. A great deal he saies to this, which I might spare the refutation of upon these reasons. First, because I compare the harmony of this Gospel to the other Gospels, with the credit of the Church, therefore do I not make this to be an Argument absolute. 2. Because I spoke of the harmony betwixt this and other Gospels, and not betwixt this Gospel and other parts of scripture: and therefore he playes the Sophister, the discourse is τὸ ἰσχυρότερον. whereas then he does deny my Argument by compare of it with other Gospels, he does not contradict me in my conclusion, which was comparative to the credit of the Church. And where he compares the harmonie of this Gospel with other parts of Scripture, he doth not conclude contradictorily to me, who onely instituted the compare of it with other Gospels. It is necessary therfore to set down my words, which were these. "Again the "harmony of it with other Gospels hath more in it to "perswade faith than the credit of the Church. So that all his disputation as to this is peccant in the ignorance of the Elench, because it comes not up to a contradiction to my terms. And besides, if the difficulties about the agreement, were so great, their infallibility pretended should have cleared them. Either we might have saving health notwithstanding those breaches, or else the plaister was defective, or else there is want of care in the Physitian. Or it may be as he said, *Plus periculi a medico quam a morbo*, but let them take my own termes in their ordinary sence, and then his assaults will lose their force before they come home to the point. For what if one *who intended a supposititious Gospel would take care not to contradict the others?* Is not therefore the harmonie of this Gospel with others a better perswasive than the credit of

the

Church? For the Argument from the Church is more extrinsical, and such Arguments are in kind less rational. And if they say the Church hath an infallible assistance, it beggs the question.

And what infringement of the harmony is it, if there be *many things related by* St. *Matthew*, and not related at all by many others? For so, they would not find an harmony of the other Gospels: and this according to Mr. *Cressy* would make this Gospel more credible, because more things are here expressed, and it may be some material. But surely to relate circumstances and not to relate circumstances, namely the same, makes no contradiction in diverse subjects, if one did say these circumstances were, and another did say these circumstances were not, this would contradict: but not to say, is not to say nor. For not to say is negative *ex parte actus*: but to say not, is negative *ex parte objecti*, which makes the contradiction in diverse subjects. Again what if there seem to be any variety betwixt the Gospel of St. *Matthew* and other parts of scripture (he should have said and other Gospels, if he would have spoken *ad idem*) in the History of the generations, must *Faustus* the *Manichean* be gratified in honour to the Roman Church. If there be any such variety, the Roman will have the worst of it: for his foundation lies principally in that Gospel. And this cannot be salved by the Church, because the Church is in question.

But he will not spare the Gospel of St. *Matthew* (as if the Roman Church needed it not) and therefore he tells us of a disagreement in the first *chap.* of St. *Matthew's* Gospel with the 2. b. of the Kings the 8*th.* ch. about *Ioram's* begetting *Ozias*, *Ioram begat* Ozias, *&c.* Well, if the Roman calls children Nephews, more reasonably may the Hebrews call real Nephews children, which are as minor sons, as he said. And so *Ioram* might be said

to beget *Oxias*, who was his *Abnepos*. Or will not *Salmeron* conceit please them, that this was so ordered in an allegory, to typifie that as 3 Kings are excluded in the History, so those that deny the doctrine of the Trinity, and deprive themselves of the three Theological vertues do deserve to be excluded salvation. But since, it seems it was the spirit of Gods purpose to put the account in tessarodecades, it was necessary that in one of them, three should be left out. And convenient it was that the omission should be in the second, that so that curse upon *Ahabs* family should be here exemplified, those three Kings being of his posterity: somewhat as *Dan* in the seventh of the *Revel.* is not numbred; because that Tribe did go away from God in Idolatry, and did mingle with the Gentiles, as is observed.

Another difficultie he urgeth about the number of the Generations; wherein one seems to be wanting, *you shall finde them to be only fortie one*; which by the account of thrice fourteen Generations should make fortie two. Ans. Our question is about the harmonie of the Gospel in the point of doctrine chiefly, this concerns historie of fact; 2. We have no reason to thinke that because we cannot comprehend all the mysteries in scripture and the waies of the jewish acount, there should be any falsitie herein. *Tertullians* rule is good, *Cedat Curiositas fidei*: 3. *Stapulensis*, it seems, said that in old copies it is found thus, *Iosias genuit Ioachim*; *Ioachim genuit Iechoniam* and those two are comprehended under one name. Since *Iechonias* is called *Iehoiachin* 4o *Regum* ch. 24 *ver.* 6. whose father *Iehoiachin* was; the father and the sonne are confounded by the similitude of the names in the greek, as some note,

Another difficultie he urgeth about the 27 of St. *Matthew ver.* 9. *Then was fulfilled that which was said by the prophet Ieremie*; whereas *the Prophet Ieremie hath no such matter in him. What harmonie appeareth here? indeed in the*

*Prophet*

*Prophet Zechary: there is in ſubſtance what* St. *Matthew ſaid.* Anſ. An errour of the ſcribe cannot diſcanonize the book in a point of circumſtance, if it were ſo as it might be, if the Goſpel was firſt written in Hebrew? for then בירמ might eaſily be read for ביד by *Ier* in ſhort and for *Ieremie* for by the hand, namely of the Prophet; which is the uſuall form of expreſſion in this kind. And alſo the Syriack expreſſeth it in the ſame manner בידא דנבייא by the hand of the Prophet. Or it may be 2. As ſome note, they were wont to put ſeverall books together, and to name all by the firſt. So *Ieremie* being firſt all were reckoned by him: and ſo that which is ſaid by *Zecharie* is attributed to *Ieremie* too being the firſt. And ſo we know that in the old Teſtament books are called by the firſt words ἀπὸ τοῦ πρώτου And 3. However this agrees with the Scripture in generall, though not particularly in termes with *Ieremie*. His other exceptions are about the difference of St. *Peter's* denying his maſter, which compared with other Evangeliſts, ſeemes *to differ in very many Circumſtances*; and then alſo in the laſt *chap.* He ſaies there are *ſome Circumſtances* about the reſurrection, which St. *Matthew* differs from the reſt in: Anſ. Theſe are ſpoken by him in generall, and *Generalia non agunt* as it is ſaid, neither do they make an action. And then 2. Somewhat may be diverſe which is not adverſe. And what one ſayes another doth not denie. If another omiſſion did make a contradiction to what one affirmes, then, if St. *Ierom* had called the Biſhop of Rome the univerſall Biſhop, (which yet he doth not) then St. *Auſtin*, not calling him ſo, had contradicted him. But then the ſuppoſed differences are about *Circumſtances*, by his own confeſſion. What is this to matter of faith in neceſſary doctrine; which is the center point of the queſtion, unto which all the lines ſhould be referred, and therfore he had done nothing, if he had done more in this kinde. And I think

thinke we are as ſure of the right in ſuch varieties as they. And alſo he might have remembred that rule of Saint *Cyrill* of Jeruſalem Τὰ περίεργα σιγάσθω ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ let things of curioſitie not be ſpoken of in the Church.

But the ſenſe of them is, that we muſt be Papiſts or no Chriſtians. But if they were Turks we might ſay more. And where nothing is neceſſarie, any thing is abundant.

He comes next to my laſt ſhift, as he callethit, that the *people doe fix their faith upon that which is interpreted, not upon the interpretation.* To this he objects thus, *you may fix your faith upon a lie, for how know you whether the thing delivered you by the interpreter, be Gods word or the interpreters own word, ſpecially when we know not who this interpreter was, how skilful, how faithful, how true a copie he uſed.* Anſ. To the confirmation of what he here objects againſt, were added diſtinct reaſons or reaſonable diſtinctions. Theſe he ſaies nothing to, but what cavil he can make againſt the concluſion; he is willing to, without anſwer to my reaſons, 2. We believe that our people can better believe the word of God in a tranſlation, than their people without a tranſlation, for the people muſt believe their Church without the knowledge of any tranſlation. Let them make their faith good without a tranſlation: and we ſhall make our faith as good in a tranſlation. And I think our people may as well credit the Authority of our Church in a tranſlation as their people may credit the Authority of their Church without a tranſlation. 3. By their own Argument they are more in the dark: for if the perſwaſive of our faith be the certainty, *who this interpreter was, how skilful, how faithful, how true a copy he uſed:* becauſe they do not know who the interpreter of St. *Matthews* Goſpel was into Greek, how skilful, how faithful, how true a copy he uſed, how can they believe it? And therefore we return him

him his own words, how know you that *this tranſlation doth not conveigh* their *own fanſies in the place of Gods word. Do they know it becauſe their fanſie* (of their Church) *tells* them *that this is Gods word? Thus then* they *may have a double phantaſtical aſſurance and nothing elſe. This* they *are forced to hold ſufficient. Yet how doth this agree with* their *own acknowledgements*, that the vulgar latin as to this is alſo a tranſlation: and yet, (as they muſt confeſs) that it is ſo far a true tranſlation *as it doth agree with the original.* They *cannot reſolve their faith into the original never propoſed to* them. *Into the tranſlation* they *ſay* they *do reſolve it.* And this muſt be the *written word. What written word is that which is neither tranſlation nor original?* For the Greek is neither their tranſlation nor their original. And yet ſurely the Greek is more like to be the original than the latin: for if there was no Hebrew copie extant, as they ſay, then was the Latin a tranſlation out of the Greek. And if they ſay the Greek was not the original then the Latin is a tranſlation without an original, which is *oppoſitum in appoſito.* So then, when all comes to all, we are as well ſetled in the tenure of our aſſurance, as to the Goſpel of St. *Matthew*, as they, or more; becauſe we ſtand to that which they have but a tranſlation of. And they have but the Latin Church for their Latin: we have the univerſal Church for the Greek. But forſooth, they believe their Church to be infallible: we do not believe the Church to be infallible. But what then? if the authority of the Church were crefcent according to the opinion of the recipient, then the Scripture had not been the word of God unleſs men had thought ſo. And then opinion would make faith: becauſe it would make infallibility. As then they muſt ſay that their Church was aſſured by the Holy Ghoſt (for ſo the termes of their Synod run, *Hæc ſacroſancta Oecumenica & generalis Synodus in ſpiritu ſancto legitime congregata*) that their Latin tranſlation is, if it be at all, authentique: ſo may we ultimately

mately believe the Goſpel of St. *Matthew* to be in the matter of it, authentique. For if there be not ſufficient aſſiſtance of the ſpirit of God to Chriſtians ſeverally, as to neceſſity of Salvation, how did the Chriſtians do before there was ever a general Council?

What is added hereabouts might have been ſpoken without Sarcaſmes, or might have been left out. *We can know which of thoſe ſo many Greek Copies is the onely true one as well as they.* And *a clown* will be as able to underſtand which is the beſt *Engliſh Tranſlation* (as if there were ſuch difference) as well as with them he can underſtand which is a right General Council, or which was in the right as to the varieties in the Latine, *Sixtus Quintus* or *Clement* the eighth. And though they cannot confer the Tranſlation *with the Original*; No more can the *Roman* People compare their Tranſlation with the Originals: and yet *Bellarmine*, as before, ſaies in ſome caſes, we muſt have recourſe to the Originals. But did not *Xavier* convert the Infidels? yes, they will ſay. So then. And did he not preach that which is in the Bible? Yes, they will ſay. And did not they believe? Yes, they will ſay. Now then how was this Faith wrought in them? By the Spirit of God, they will ſay, or they muſt ſay. For they could not compare that which was ſaid by him with the Originals or with the Doctrine of the Church. So then our people can believe without conferring a Tranſlation with the Originals, as well as theirs. And they know who ſaid, *Si fides in doctos ſolos caderet, nihil eſſet pauperius Deo.* And again, *Surgunt indocti & rapiunt cœlum, &c.* as the Father. The very neck then of this point may be thus reſolved. In the order of credibles their firſt Propoſition is, The Church is infallible. Our firſt Propoſition is, The Scripture is the Word of God. Now their Propoſition is grounded in Authority: or elſe is believed by its own light. Not by its own light; for then the Scripture may be believed ſo, which they deny. Then it

is

is grounded in Authority. That, either Humane or Divine. Humane Authority cannot make Faith. No Divine Authority, but either that of Scripture; or internal, by the Holy Ghoſt. Not by Scripture, then that Propoſition of theirs is not the firſt. Then by the Holy Ghoſt: and then by the ſame way we believe the Scripture to be the Word of God, as they believe the Church to be infallible. And ſo they muſt at length reſt in our Principles.

In this num. (beſide ſomewhat in the beginning, anſwered before) he would very fain repair the credit of the vulgar Latin, which I had broken by an inſtance of *Gen.* 3. 15. where it reads *ipſa* for *ipſum*; referring to the Mother what belongs to the Son. To this he ſaies, *It is clear ſome Hebrew copies may moſt exactly be tranſlated* ipſum. *How know you the Church followed the falſe Hebrew copie?* Satis caute. *Some copies. Not all. May be.* Not are. *Moſt exactly be tranſlated*, not ſome moſt exact copies. Well. Are not theſe copies the greater number? And indeed are they not the moſt exact? yea can they truly be tranſlated otherwiſe? and how know they that their Church followed the true Hebrew copie? If it did not follow it infallibly; or if they cannot know infallibly that it did follow it infallibly, infallibly they are undone; becauſe they are upon terms of an infallible faith in an infallible Church. Therefore though we can ſhake their foundation by our queſtion; they cannot ſettle their foundation by their queſtion. And yet we have another queſtion. He asks again, *How many moſt grave and moſt antient Fathers have alſo read* ipſa? Surely he does well to ask how many, becauſe he does not know how few. Their names may they not be written in a nut ſhel? and *Bellarmin*, upon the place, hath not many for it. And ſome of them ſurely not moſt grave and alſo moſt ancient Fathers. But as for St. *Auſtin*, *Bellarmin*, might as well or better have left him out of the Catalogue. For though he renders it, N. 48.

*ipſa*, in his 11. *de Gen. ad literam c.* 36. and in another place; yet he doth not expound it, as they of the Virgin, for he makes it to be myſtically underſtood. *Significatur ſemine diaboli perverſa, ſemine autem mulieris fructus boni operis: & illa obſervat caput ejus ut eum in ipſo initio malæ ſuaſionis excludat.* He might alſo have omitted St. *Ambroſe*, in his 2. b. *de fuga ſæculi cap.* 7. for there he interprets it morally, not referring it to the Virgin. And both of them alſo differ from the Hebrew and their vulgar in the other words, and follow the Septuagint. For they tranſlate it, *ipſa ſervabit caput tuum*, which doth not agree with the Hebrew, with which the vulgar, in this, doth agree. But *Bellarmine* alſo nameth St. *Chryſoſtom* in his 17. homily upon *Gen.* But then they muſt have ſome other edition of him if they will make uſe of his teſtimony for them. For in three places of this homily, he renders it αὐτολέξει, according to the ſeptuagint, αὐτὸς σε τηρήσει τὴν κεφαλήν. That which he would think, it may be, to be for this uſe, is this, Καὶ οὐκ αὐτὴν μόνην, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ σπέρμα αὐτῆς τῷ σπέρματί σου πολέμιον διηνεκῆ ἐργάσομαι. And not her alone (the woman) but I will make her ſeed to be a perpetual enemy to thy ſeed. Yet upon this he doth immediately ſubjoyne the text, as before. Αὐτός σε τηρήσει τὴν κεφαλήν. Thus *Bellarmin* doth not yet bring ἰατρικὴν χεῖρα. indeed all they can do is much too little to cure this breach. For *S. Jerom* is more conſiderable in this criticiſm than all the Fathers named. And he ſaies, *melius in Hebræo, ipſe conteret caput tuum.* Nay *Bellarmin* in the place quoted by him, ſaith he had ſeen one copy (he ſpeaks of no more, as he would ſurely if he had could) and yet doth not tell us where. So that, to ſpeak at leaſt *de communi* and ὡς ἐπὶ πολύ, this reading *ipſa*; is not agreeable to the Hebrew copies. Nay *Bellarmin* doth ſweat at it; and therefore ſaies ſome copies of the vulgar Latin do interpret it *ipſe*, in the former Chap. And this makes a new difficulty on their part to reconcile the contrariety to the infalli-

infallibility of the Church in both. The Church was deceived in one, and where then is their infallibility they ſpeak of? This is their modeſty then, againſt the gender in the Hebrew, againſt the Samaritan, Syriack, Arabick, tranſlations, which referre it to the ſeed, againſt all Hebrew copies which *Bellarmin* had ſeen but one, againſt ſome of their own copies of the vulgar Latin, to make that Scripture for the Creature, which belongs to the Son of God.

And alſo whether the Fathers *moſt grave and moſt antient* are for their interpretation, we have examined and therefore he needed not be ſo plain as to ſay *it was a loud lie of* Chemnitius *to ſay the contrary*: And will they ſay ſo to *Lucas Brugenſis*, who ſaies as much as *Chemnitius* in this point, almoſt all the Fathers do read *ipſe*, as is noted. Let me then ſay, it would become them here to give glory to Chriſt immediately, and to confeſs this fault.

And yet neither doth he competently anſwer to the queſtion made to him, why the Greek was not made infallibly the Church as well as the Latin. *That we have his declaration that the Latin vulgar is authentique and not deficient in any point concerning faith or manners*, this he ſaies: but this will not ſerve, as may appear thus. A tranſlation of that which is not authentique cannot be authentique; now let them determine whether it was made authentique or not. If not made authentique, being a tranſlation (as they ſay) then how can the Latin be ſo declared an authentique tranſlation? for then the Church muſt have *vim operativam* too, not onely declaratory: and the effect ſhall exceed the material cauſe. Or if it was declared authentique, what of an infallible tranſlation. 2. Whereas he ſaies therefore *it is not deficient in any point neceſſarie to faith and manners*. To wit the Latin tranſlation, we take notice of it that theſe words have a ſenſe in them intended for their uſe; namely not to be underſtood abſolutely, as if there were

no error at all therein: but reſtrictively, ſpecificatively, no ſuch errour but that it may be ſufficient to direct us in *faith and manners*. So then, when he hath made uſe of his own words for his own turne, we will make uſe of them for our purpoſe, and we will not ſqueeſe them neither.

The firſt corollarie then from theſe words of his, is this, that he dares not ſtand to an abſolute infallibilitie of the Church in every point whatſoever: and therefore by Mr. *Knott's* argument he muſt abate of his former poſtulate of it's being the ground and cauſe of faith. 2. Thus much we may as well or better ſay for our tranſlation that it is *not deficient in any point neceſſary to faith and manners*. 3. It ſemes then ſalvation is not in danger by ſome errours: otherwiſe their tranſlation ſhould be deficent in points neceſſarie to faith and manners; and therefore we need not, upon danger of ſalvation, have an infallible Judge to decide all points emergent. 4. Things neceſſarie to faith and manners are ſufficiently ſet down in ſcripture, for otherwiſe the Latin tranſlation muſt be deficient; or elſe it muſt have more then the orignal; and then, as to this, it is not a tranſlation yet 5. Then neceſſitie of traditions is excluded, for then it could not be truely ſaid that the Latin Bible is not deficient in any point neceſſary to faith and manners. 6. Exceptions againſt St. *Matthew's* Goſpel, which are not *in points neceſſarie to faith and manners*, do not hinder the authentickneſs of the Greek; becauſe the Latin is authentick as not being deficient in points neceſſarie to faith and manners. 7. We may infer from hence thus, thoſe errours in the Latin Bible, though not material to faith or manners, might have been ſaved by the Church or not: if they might have been ſaved, then the Church may deceive our truſt, if they could not then it may be deceived: and ſo we have but a *fallible ground* for our aſſent to any of her definitions

and

and in particular, for the Goſpel of St. *Matthew*. *So that all his ſhifts fail* him *in this important point*. Surely this whole point about the belief of Scripture to be the word of God, was a great ſhift of his: for the ſubject ſhould have been ſuppoſed in the diſpute of the attributes. The point in queſtion was whether the Scripture doth clearly propound things neceſſary to Faith and manners. And he hath blotted how much Paper to debate our tenure of the Scripture. Yet it may be, he hath gotten nothing by it, nor by the *Holy Fathers*, whom he hath ſomewhat to ſay to onely for himſelf.

The greateſt part of this Paragraph comes too late, And all that would ſeem to take away my former Anſwers, is taken away. My Anſwer to his Exception, that *Luther* did not ſee the *Apocalyps* and the Epiſtle of Saint *James* to be canonical, is yet ſufficient; that the negative Argument doth not conclude. He replies, *in* our *caſe it is a ſtrong proof*. I again deny the Conſequence. The objects have themſelves equally to all: but they are not equally ſeen; ſurely not in *this caſe*, becauſe the Spirit of God is a free Agent. Yea Saint *Luke* the 24. 16. their eyes were holden that they could not ſee him. Gods actings upon objects, and in degrees, are at his own pleaſure. And ſecondly, The ſenſe of the definitions of the Church is viſible, is it not? If not, how are we guided? If ſo, yet every one doth not ſee them. And thirdly, If *Luther* had ſuch an *irradiated* underſtanding, why did he not yet ſee, and *Spalatenſis* alſo, the Monarchy of the Church to be of Divine Right? if he had not, why doth he ſay ſo? *The light is the ſame, the Propoſition is the ſame*: his *eyes or underſtanding no better nor more aſſiſted*, why then did not they ſee what he ſees?

As to his Anſwer to my ſecond Anſwer [you ſee we do not follow him (*Luther*) blindly:] we need not return any thing but this, that he miſtakes me in the terme [blindly] he ſuppoſeth me to ſpeak as in relation to this point.

point about the Books denied or doubted of by him: but I ſpoke it in general, that we do not follow him with blinde obedience as the Jeſuites do their General.

And though the *Apocalyps and other Books were doubted of*, this doth not prejudice us, no more than it doth them for the viſibility of the Church, and the reception of the Books Apocryphal. Theſe Books were received by them becauſe they were worthy to be received or not; but arbitrarily. If the former, why did not thoſe before ſee them to be ſuch? If the latter, then infallibility proceeds by the will: and ſo infallibility may be on either part of the contradiction. And ſo we have no reaſon to ſay any more, if whatſoever they *will* ſay, is infallible.

Further he chargeth us with obtruding *a Canon of our own coyning for Iudge of controverſies*. Here is two things falſe, Firſt, That we obtrude a new Canon. This not ſo, we have the ſame Canon which the ancient Fathers had before the Council of *Carthage*. But they have made a new Canon, by taking in the Apocryphal: and by canonizing the vulgar Latine. And the other is falſe; for we do not obtrude the Scripture, as Judge of controverſies in any formal ſenſe.

And again he would mar the Canon, *all agreeing that divers Books of the true Canon be quite loſt*. How often comes this in? But firſt, He muſt go leſs: not divers Books, which may import many. One or two are not in common account divers. If then he means by [divers] many Books, ſo *all* do not agree. If he means one or two, ſo not divers. Secondly, He takes the termes [*the true Canon*] either reſpectively to thoſe Divine Books which were inſpired, and yet never put into the Canon, as it was reveiwed by S. *Iohn*, as learned men ſuppoſe: or after they were put in and acknowledged: If the former, he cannot ſay that we have not a true and juſt Canon as to that which is neceſſary. And if he denies it, he is a friend

friend to *Celsus*, *Porphyrie* and *Iulian*. But if the latter, then who lost them? Surely those who had the minde to keep the reputation of the necessary use of Traditions upon this account. But if Traditions be but as necessary (as the *Trent* Council intends in those terms *pari pietatis affectu*) why may we not think that some of these may be lost also? and then *where shall we finde the Iudge*, who is to determine of points by the tenure of Traditions; or else some of their most acute and learned men have lost their insight into ground of truth?

*Amongst us (after the Church's declaration was notified concerning any book for canonical) you will never finde it to be doubted of by any true Catholick.* Ans. This argument concludes (if true) unity, but not truth. Things of Divinity are not to be measured by such a Lesbian rule.

And this agreement cannot prove their Canon good, for unles the Canon was good, the agreement was not good. 2. If we should bring things of debate to no other test, we should never have any determination. for what is there which is not questioned by some of them? Now it is all one to the Romanists, whether the Canon be questioned or any thing else which the Church proposeth, since they are bound to believe all alike: but to the point in question. *Gregory* was a true Catholike. *Gregory* did not hold the Book of *Machabees* to be canonical, after declaration by the Council of *Carthage*; therefore that which he saies is false. The major was commended to them before the assumption, they may see in the 19. of his Morals the 15. Ch. Therefore they had best hold the Book of *Machabees* to be Canonical onely so as to be read in Churches. And if so onely (as Saint. *Ierom* also held) then this book is not simply canonical: if otherwise, that which he saies is not true; and *Gregory* was not of their opinion. So then we have

——*Pares Aquilas & pila minantia pilis*,

Pope against Pope; infallibility against infallibility.

And

And since we know which is right, we must deny both.

N. 50. Here he tels us of an argument in the 14 num. of the former treatise, with infallible faith, this is the τὸ ζητούμενον and therefore he beggs the question. And if they cannot prove the cause to be theirs with out our free graunt, they are not like to have it. And therefore, this being denied him, as before, all that he would build thereupon must fall. to wit, *therefore we must be assisted in this infallible knowledge by some other infallible means and no other infallible meanes can with any shadow of probability, be said given to us but the infallible authority of the Church; therefore her athority must be infallible, as shall at large be shewed in the next chap. and then in the next after that, that this infallible Church is the Roman and none but the Roman.* This is all wast and lost, unles they could maintain it to be necessary charity in us to preserve their cause from starving by graunting that which it ought not to have. And 2. *Dato non concesso*, suppose there must be some other meanes of infallible deciding doubtful sense of Scripture, I can make it a question whether they can plead the next right, as if they came *vacuam possessionem*, for the place may be ful by universal tradition; which surely is not the same with the Roman Church: for the whole surely is greater then the part, and then also when you prove the Roman faith by universal tradition, you would prove the Roman faith by the Roman, and this is *idem per idem*. And as for the 3. thing, that *this infallible Church is the Roman and none but the Roman*, which he saies he will prove in the *last chapter*; surely, if I may speak it without offence, he does very well to refer it to the last: for he may doe any thing before it. But also since his supposition, that we cannot be certain by *the Scriptures (infallibly) of their own true sense in points necessary to salvation with infallible faith*, must fall without a better support, we may be at our last already, for if this be not good, the other chapters make number.

And

And this number makes no weight. He doth nothing in it but tell us that he hath done ſo and ſo; which we interpret nothing. Infallibility ſhould not need many words.

In this, he would wipe off the ſuſpicion of diſreſpect to Scipture in thoſe termes he uſed; and would lay a blame upon me for my cenſure of his words to this purpoſe. *His words* were theſe, *if he would have given us a book for Iudge he would never have given us for our Iudge ſuch a book as Scripture is which very often ſpeaketh obſcurely, ſometimes ſo prophetically that moſt would think it ſpake of the preſent time, when it ſpeaketh of the time to come; that it ſpeaketh of one perſon, for example of* David, *when it ſpeaketh of another; for example of Chriſt. And much more I added to this effect; that I might be rightly underſtood when I ſaid that God would never have given us ſuch a book for our Iudge.* To what of this he ſaid in his former treatiſe, I ſaid Sir, "Let "me have leave to ſpeak affectionately to you. Do not "you ſee what diſreſpects of Scripture (if not blaſphe-"mies) your opinion doth miſerably betray you to, if "you follow it. Would any ſober man let fall ſuch words, "as if God had intended the Scripture for our judge, ſuch "a book as Scripture is. So you. This I ſaid. N. 52.

And now he examins theſe words ſtrictly, and ſaies. *My adverſary, to avoide this argument, ſo mangleth the ſenſe that he may make my words ſound of a blaſphemous diſreſpect, reporting them as if I ſhould have ſaid, if God had intended Scripture for our Iudge, he would not have given us ſuch a book as Scripture.* Anſ. Surely this is a falſe charge that I have mangled his words, for I have given the full ſenſe of them. And this may be demonſtrated by denying of the end, which he makes to be, *to avoide* the *argument*. For I do not ſee any ſuch difficulty in the argument, that I ſhould decline it and fall upon the perſon. This is not my mind or manner. But I could find fault with his dealing with me even here: for he puts together that which I did not put

together. For he ſaies I accuſed him of a blaſphemous diſreſpect, whereas I ſaid [diſreſpect [if not blaſphemies] and alſo the termes [if not blaſphemies] without a grain of charity might have been conſtrued without an affirmation. Nether doth he right me or clear himſelf in the proſecution of his defence. For my words in all reaſon, doe repreſent as much as if I had added what he ſaid I ſhould have added. Theſe words, [if God had intended a book for our Iudge, he would not have given us ſuch a book as Scripture] muſt connotate this ſenſe, that he would not have given us ſuch a book as Scripture for our Iudge. And therefore he needed not to quarrel upon the omiſſion as if I had not dealt fairely with him, conſider, it in the form of an hypothetical propoſition [if God had intended a book for our Iudge, he would not have given us ſuch a book as Scripture is] what need be added [for our Iudge] when it is underſtood of courſe. They know the rule *Quod neceſſario ſubintelligitur, nunquam deeſt.* That which is neceſſarily underſtood is never wanting. And therefore have I not done his words any injury by mangling them: nor yet by interpretation of them ſtill *they ſeem to ſound ſuch an imperfect book as Scripture:* and muſt do ſo, if they have full ſenſe in them. But alſo if we might ſay what S. *Auſtin* ſaid of the *Heretiques words, Bene hæc acciperentur niſi ab eo dicerentur cujus ſenſus notus eſt*; ſo here, theſe words might be better conſtrued if they were not ſpoken by ſuch whoſe ſenſe was known. For unleſs the Scripture be a book imperfect in regard of matter, what need of tradition? unleſs the Scripture were imperfect in regard of clearenes, what needed an infallible judge to decide controverſies about the ſenſe.

Therefore he cannot get clearely off. *Aqua hæret.* And ſurely he doth not helpe himſelf or his cauſe by a like caſe he puts, *if God had intended the Scripture for ſole Iudge in Law controverſies, he would never have given us ſuch a book as Scripture is for our Iudge.* Doth this paſſe

any

any handſome and reſpective reflexion upon Scripture. As if it were no fitter to decide controverſies in Divinity then in the Law? And do they not think that we may have more reaſon to be bold with them than they with Scripture? if God had intended that we ſhould have been abſolutely determined in matters of faith by General Council, would he have given us ſuch a pack'd Council as the Council of *Trent* was? And yet moreover all he ſaies is beſides the mark. For this we doe not contend for that the ſcripture is the ſole Judge intended by God: for we do not ſay that it is fomally any Judge. But we ſay that the Scripture doth ſo fully and ſo plainely ſet down things neceſſary ſo fully and ſo plainely that there is no neceſſity of tradition for more matter, or of infallible Judge for more clear propoſal of things neceſſary, ſo that this which he ſaies is peccant in the ignorance of the Elench.

He ſaies yet, *is it not manifeſt that the Scripture may be a book as perfect as can be for the intent for which God made it?* This we may take for his propoſition. Then *Bellarmin*, as before acknowledgeth it to be our rule, againſt the Aanbaptiſts: and therfore it is a perfect rule. But elſewhere *Bellarmin* will have it to be but our commonitory then why doth he diſpute it to be a rule againſt the Aanbaptiſts?

Whereas then my adverſary would return the diſgrace to Scripture upon me, he does not or will not underſtand me, for we do not ſay, nor are bound to ſay that *all neceſſary controverſies are plainly decided by Scripture alone*, and, *that God intended the Scripture for the plain deciſion of them:* and therefore we deny his conſequences, that ſince, *when it comes to the trial we are not able to ſhew any text of Scripture deciding many and moſt important controverſies, this in effect* were *to ſay God performed very inſufficiently what he intended to doe by Scripture.* firſt we doe not ſay that all neceſſary controverſies are plainly decided by Scripture: for we ſay no controverſies

are neceſſary in point of neceſſary faith. He puts in [neceſſary controverſies] for neceſſary truths, we ſay the Scripture plainly propoſeth all neceſſary truths: and he would bring us in ſaying, that the Scripture plainly decides all neceſſary controverſies, and therefore how can he ſay that we ſay God intended the Scripture for the plain deciſion of them? 2. Therefore we deny thoſe points to be ſimply neceſſary to ſalvation which are not clearly propoſed in Scripture. 3. Whereas they ſay that the Scripture doth propoſe upon Gods intention the Church to be the infallible Judge in matters of faith, and yet cannot ſhow any text wherein this is clearly delivered, they do diſhonor God and Scripture and they diſhonor God by accuſing of Scripture; as *Nilus* before.

In this number he holds the concluſion, that expreſſions of Scripture are obſcure in way of prophecy or type, and that there is no certain mean of direction to the ſenſe; and then that therefore there muſt be an infallible Judge. But nothing is anſwered to my anſwers about it. And did he think that the *Iewes* did not underſtand the manner of expreſſions of the prophets in their own language, or that *David* did not beare the type of Chriſt? How elſe were they ſaved in the time before Chriſt? And was the exact ſenſe of every expreſſion or type neceſſary? ſuch exceptions do not weigh. And then again, if there had been need in the time of the law of an infallible Judge for an infallible Illumination of dark expreſſions then; if ſo, *dato non conceſſo*, what is this to the neceſſity of an infallible Judge in the times of the Goſpel which is the old Teſtament revealed.

N. 54. To paſſe by any ſlips in the former number by the ſcribe or otherwiſe, we come to this paragr. wherein he is not pleaſed to ſay any thing to what was replied about the ſeveral ſenſes of Scripture. But he would here corroborate his argument with Dr. *Tailer's* Judgment in his diſcourſe of the liberty of prophecying. And he ſaies he thinkes me not to be ſo much eſteemed *amongſt* our *own*

*Clergy*

*Clergy or Laity*, as he. I confeſſe it *Neque de me quiſquam vilius ſentit quam ipſe*, as one ſaid. But though this is very true that my authority is not comparable to his, yet it was not rational for my adverſary to diminiſh me becauſe it makes a prejudice to his cauſe that ſo weak a man can oppoſe it, and therefore I can ſpare him in this kind. Let my adverſary be the Champion of his cauſe. And yet it may be the Reverend and learned Authour he names is not allwaies pleaſed with whatſoever he ſaid in that book. And yet alſo we can grant what is ſaid by the Doctor who does not ſay that no Arguments can be drawn from Scripture, but from thoſe Scriptures which have *many ſenſes*, neither doth he ſay that thoſe texts which have many ſenſes do contain points neceſſary to ſalvation, nor doth he ſay, that if they did contain points neceſſary they are not elſewhere explained by more clear texts, or may be explained: for ſo he ſhould diſagree from St. *Auſtin*, as before.

But to ſay no more, let the Doctor have the honour with all my heart of the umpirage of the controverſie in the example, which my adverſary hath put, *Take for an example thoſe four words, This is my body.*

Indeed ſome there are which would have five words, *hoc eſt (enim) corpus meum.* And alſo it may be ſaid that he may exceed in his number of interpretations of theſe words, unleſs he takes in their own many differences hereabouts in the manner and time of the converſion, they will hardly come up to two hundred divers interpretations. And whereas he ſaies that we ſay that *they are ſpoken in a figurative ſenſe and not in their natural ſenſe*, we can anſwer that we do deny the literal ſenſe; and do not deny that the figurative ſenſe may be ſaid in a good ſort *natural* to the Sacramental uſe by reaſon of the σχέσις there is betwixt the ſigne and the thing Signified. And much more might be ſaid herein, but let this point be compromiſed to the doctour in that excellent book which he hath lately written on purpoſe.

He

He saies all that I can say and more.

Here he would make good another Argument of his [*the Scripture useth the imperative mood as well when it counsels as when it commands*] He asks now, *what infallible means we have to know what is recommended to us as a counsel, or as a precept to be kept under pain of damnation.* We answer, first, supposing the doctrine of counsels to be right and sound, yet are they in no great danger by the uncertainty whether such a thing is proposed by way of counsels or precept; since they hold it to be a thing of greater perfection to performe a counsel. Therefore if they take a thing of counsel for a thing of command there is no danger surely in doing more then they are simply commanded to. So then if this were all, it would be no such difficulty as to practise, because if they doe whatsoever is proposed *pro imperio* in the imperative mood, there is no danger if it be commanded, it was necessary if counselled, there is greater perfection and an accidental reward above the essential. God can distinguish which is which, though they cannot; and surely will if their opinion be true, reward them accordingly. And if there be any merit, it would be more meritorious to do that which is more meritorious without knowledge of it to be such, because then they do it more free from intention of more merit 2. If the distinction of a command be simply difficult, as to the negative, whether it be a command or not; the omission of it is not, without all hope, damnative where there is general repentance.

And now to the counsels he saies, in clearing this *my teeth bite St.* Paul, *who expresly supposeth with me that there is counsels of perfection above things of command.* And he names the 1 *Ep. to the Cor.* 7. 25. *and* 38. And then he saith *How doth this agree with your strange Divinity?* We answer, very well with our Divinity which is not so strange as true. First they are too forward in the catching at the word

*Coun-*

*Counſel*, [I give my counſel] it is γνώμην δίδωμι. now ſurely, there is no great criticiſm in the difference betwixt γνώμη and βουλή. The former is a grave and wiſe opinion or ſentence, not a councel in the Roman ſenſe. Or if it were taken for an advice; every adviſe of the Apoſtle was not a pontifician counſel. For this advice he might give them not out of any command from God, but upon his private judgement: and therefore it doth not ground the doctrine of perfection in the obſervation of Counſels above the Law. Secondly, as it is noted, this is not delivered to all promiſcuouſly as the counſels are, but to thoſe who had the gift of continency as ver. 7. which gift is not given to every one as Faith Hope and Charity, becauſe this gift of continency is not neceſſary to ſalvation, in the confeſſion of our adverſaries, as the other graces are, but to perfection of ſtate or ſtate of perfection. Thirdly this is not given abſolutely for time, but with reſtriction of time, as, in the 26. *ver.* διὰ τὴν ἐνεστῶσαν ἀνάγκην, for the preſent neceſſity in the times of perſecution, and he ſaies here νομίζω, I ſuppoſe: ſo that he ſpake not this by inſpiration, it ſeems. Fourthly, the matter of counſel is more difficult than that of ordinary obedience. Yes they will ſay, for otherwiſe how ſhould they thereby ſupererogate and make the ſtate of perfection? and yet to ſerve God then in thoſe times in the married condition was more difficult, as being under more temptations for their family. Fiftly as to the 38. ver. it is not neceſſary to conſtrue *well* and *better*, *de bono morali*, but *de bono commodo*, in reſpect to thoſe times. As goodneſs is grounded in convenience, ſo it was more good, not to give in marriage, for thoſe times. And here is all that Text can afford him. As for his Syllogiſme therefore, there is no great force in it. *According to you he is bound to do all that he can do: but he could do better in not giving her in marriage, therefore according to you was he bound not to give her under pain of damnation.* Anſ. As for the Major, it is not any other than the propoſition of Chriſt, but my

my adverſary ſhould have put in here what he puts in the concluſion, namely [under pain of damnation] and then it might have been denied: for God accepts that which is done in ſincerity and true charity, though it be not all that we can do, let him or them then put theſe words into the Major propoſition and we can then deny it: if not, there is more in the concluſion than in the premiſes. Then to the minor we ſay, firſt *better* is not neceſſary to be taken abſolutely but with reſpect to thoſe ends which are ſpoken of in the Ch. and therefore is it to be underſtood, as is obſerved, not comparatively to the performance of commands, but comparatively to the oppoſite, to marriage; As *Gerſon* is quoted, *cum conſilia dicuntur eſſe de meliori bono, non fit comparatio eorum ad præcepta, ſed ad ſua contraria.* And let me put them a caſe upon this point, one in ſtate of virginity is ſuppoſed to abound more with luſtful deſires (which are oppoſite to internal chaſtity) then one married: Now which of theſe, think they, in this particular, more perfect, in the judgement of God: that party which doth not profeſs external chaſtity, yet is in the mind more chaſt, or that party which doth profeſs external chaſtity and is internally leſs chaſt? what will they ſay to this? for this is *caſus dabilis*, they muſt ſay that the party profeſſing virginity is more perfect: but then it is not better to marry than to burn: and then they contradict St. *Paul* in the former ch. v. 9.

Then with the former Text he confronts that of our "Saviour, which I produced againſt him, St. *Luke* the 17. "10. So likewiſe when you have done all thoſe things "that are commanded you, ſay we are unprofitable ſer-"vants, we have done what we ought to do. And here my adverſary puts in by way of diſtinction, *he ſaith not, which are onely commanded by way of Counſel.* And again he puts in, what *we ought to do to wit by an expreſs precept obliging under damnation.* And then he applies the former Text, *In one ſenſe this man who hath not married his daughter*

*may*

*may truly ſay I have done what I ought to do not out of ſtrict obligation binding under pain of hell (for I might have done well in doing the contrary) but what I ought to do out of moſt perfect charity.* Anſ. Paſſing by what we ſaid to the former Text ſimply, we ſay to it as compared with this of Chriſt, that this Text of Chriſt doth not well bear his diſtinction, becauſe the termes ſpeak altogether in contradiſtinction unto counſels: it ſpeaks of doing *all that was commanded*: it ſpeaks of their *being unprofitable ſervants*: it ſpeaks of doing what they ought to do upon *ſtrict obligation*: for ſo ὀφείλομεν there bears due correſpondence with διατάσσητε: and this word ſignifies a ſtrict command. Secondly compare this Text with the ſcope of it in the πρόθεσις; which we have in the 7, 8, 9. *verſes*. And as the ſervant attends the Maſter in neceſſary ſervices; ſo alſo in the tenth verſe which is the ἀπόδοσις, the creature is related to God in neceſſary ſervices of ſtrict obedience: and therefore he cannot here diſtinguiſh of what we ought to do, upon *ſtrict obligation*, and what we ought to do *out of moſt perfect charity*. Thirdly this diſtinction of theirs will deſtroy their doctrine of counſels: becauſe, if counſels be grounded in a duty *of moſt perfect charity*, then nothing can be counſelled which is not commanded, becauſe moſt perfect charity is under a command. If moſt perfect charity were under a counſel, then there might indeed be more ſaid for counſels: but ſince moſt perfect charity is under a command, what ground is there for counſels when the root of them namely moſt perfect charity is under a command, and expreſs precept St. *Matth.* 22. 37. Thou ſhalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy ſoul and with all thy mind. And this cannot be moulded into the notion of a counſel; for thus Chriſt anſwers to the queſtion in the ver. before, what is the great Commandement of the Law. And alſo in the ver. after he ſaies, this is the firſt and great Commandement. Now to do thus is moſt perfect charity:

and therefore what we can do is comprehended under all that is commanded, yea, if the law requires more then we can do (according to ordinary measure of grace) then we cannot do more than the law requires, now this the law requires and not only *semper* but *ad semper* as to the internal duty of love. And who is there in all the world that loves the Lord alwaies with all his heart, with all his soul, with all his mind? And therfore Gods law is not to be cut short that it may be made even with our ability present.

Neither doth the text named by him out of St. *John* prove obedience to the law possible to us in the way: we may keep Gods commandements in *generale*, though not all as we ought: as we are said to keep the way, though sometimes we transgresse. We may keep the commandements as a man keeps a Castle against the enemies he keeps it till he be beat out of it, he keeps it against forsaking it: but he doth not keep it so as not to be overcome; he keeps them as to the purpose of his mind; he doth not keep them absolutly as to all acts negative in commands, negative and positive acts in affirmative commands. He keeps them not, as keeping contradicts all offending, for in many things we offend all, as St. *James* speaks. And therefore can we not fulfil the law, because the same Apostle saies 2 ch. 10. He that keeps the whole law, and offend in one shall be guilty of all. And therefore this argument is peccant in the ignorance of the Elench, for we can say that we may keep the commandements & yet not fulfil them, according to the power we had in *Adam*, and according to the measure of the obligation, which is not adequated to our strength now, but to Gods law as an expres of his holines, and as commensurable to mans ability in state of Original righteousnes. Nay it is observable also that the word in St. *James*, which is rendered shall offend, is as diminutive a word in the kind as I think any other, for it is ἁδρον left *Hindan* and the rest of that sort should think that venial sinnes do but cast a little dust upon

on a Christians life; no defilement. And therefore to conclude upon the whole matter, if the Scripture needs an infallible interpreter to distinguish betwixt counsels and precepts both given in the mood of command, this makes no difficulty until counsels find better proof. If they will take our counsel let them keep their counsel to themselves.

This we may say as litle to as he saies in it of new dis- N. 56.
course. He speaks here again of the losse of Divine books. This we have spoken to before more then once upon his provocation. And this pincheth them: for why may not they then faile of some *traditions*, and how then can we depend upon the Church, when the Church should have kept them, since the Church, as the learned of them say, is to depend upon them. But own thing here he would urge, that according to us, we must pick out points necessary, *one out of one Book another out of another*. Ans. Surely this is no strong plea, for first, ought not the word of God dwel plentifully in us, as the Apostle speaks? 2. Cannot any own easily discern historical books from doctrinal? 3. Can they not take special notice of those heads of doctrine or practice unto which salvation is expressely annexed. 4. This argument concludes more heavily against them for depending upon the Church. Who can compare all their books from age to age for their doctrin? who can compare who hath been most learned and most faithful to derive a successional summe of things to be believed and to be done? nay who in the compare of Churches can preferre the best but by the best doctrin? and yet according to them we must take the doctrine from the Churches: who can measure the vast latitude of the universal Church by those rules of *Vincentius*? is it not easier to receive necessaries from Scripture then to boult them out of so many volumes of ages? And how should we be sure of keeping *received traditions*, when some traditions which were received are not yet kept by the Roman

Church? 5. In Scripture though we pick for neceſſaries, yet we have nothing falſe: but we have falſe traditions; have we not? yea this is a falſe tradition that traditions are equal to Scripture, Yea 6. If any books be loſt they were loſt before Chriſts time; and yet thoſe which remained in St. *Pauls* time were able to make *Timothie* wiſe unto ſalvation. And towards the reading of the Apocryphal books that ſo we may reade *over the whole Canon*, it is a ſuppoſition in ſtead of proofe. The reading of them in the Church doth not inferre their canonicalneſs of proper name, and this is made good to them they know lately by the Reverend and Learned Dr. *Coſins*, in a book on purpoſe.

And as for accurate noting *all places* and conferring with *other places*. What then? *multa non experimur quia difficilia: multa difficilia quia non experimur*. Is not this poſſible? is not Salvation worth the paines? muſt every one amongſt them know the diſtinct exact ſenſe of all their definitions? no, they will ſay: but the people ſhould ſeek the law at the Prieſts mouths. Well then, ſo is it not neceſſary to Salvation that the people with us ſhould be able exactly to conferre all places: and as for thoſe places which contain neceſſaries, there is not ſuch obſcurity. And yet ſurely ſome hardneſs, according to their principles, doth belong to faith; for how otherwiſe ſhould it be ſupernatural and meritorious? therefore if their way of beliefe be ſo eaſie, it doth not beare proportion to the qualities of faith aſſigned by Mr. *Knott*.

And as for *Tranſlations* to *agree with the Originals*, this we have canvaſed before. And our people can do it as well as theirs & better too, becauſe they have liberty of tranſlations. And to the truth of originals we muſt come in ſeveral cauſes, as *Bellarmin* before. *Omne reducitur ad principiun*, is good here too. And then the conſectary of theſe difficulties he would make to be negative to us; *namely that God did not intend this book to be our only guide*. And he would perſwade us thus. *Gods wiſedome directs him to the beſt means*

*meanes to compaſs his intention.* And then he would frame a minor with advantage thus, *even our ordinary wiſedome (if we had an intention to ſet forth a writing to end all neceſſary controverſies) would direct us to ſet down plainly & clearly in one place all thoſe (few as you ſay) points neceſſary to be believed.* So then, this muſt be a good argument, man in ſuch a caſe, in ordinary wiſedome, would do ſo, therefore God hath done ſo. Surely theſe Romaniſts ſpeak from the top of the Capital; and will not only teach men, but God. One found fault blaſphemouſly with Gods creation, thinking and ſaying that he could have made it better. So. But the Schoolemen might have told my adverſaries that though God could have made ſeveral things in their accidentals, better: yet they could not but ſay that he could not make them in a better manner, *Meliori modo.* So then, alſo, if they believe that God did make the Scripture, they may believe that he could not make it in a better and more wiſe manner. Let them ſatisfie then St. *Pauls* queſtion, who hath been his Counceller? And then the argument from man to God will binde. And yet 2. Turn the tables, and this diſcourſe is returned to them; if God had intended the Church for our infallible guide he would clearly (ſince *his wiſdome directs him to the beſt means* for the compaſſing of his intention) have told us ſo in one place or other; as well as man tells us plainly who is our judge in point of law, this they ſhould have demonſtrated, but no more need be ſaid of this, ſince the queſtion is *de facto.*

Yet another argument of this kind he hath againſt us, God hath ſet down the cermonies in Leviticus *fully, particularly and clearly: points of faith neceſſary to ſalvation import incomparably more then points of meer ceremonie. If then God had intended a book by which only he was reſolved to deliver unto us all points neceſſary to ſalvation, theſe points, as you ſay, being few, he would in ſome one part of theſe books have clearly ſet down thoſe few points a thouſand times more importing than points of ceremony.* Anſ. Surely he hath better

better arguments or a bad cauſe, becauſe he in the time of the law appointed a Sanedrin as a ſtanding Aſſembly to judge all cauſes and the high prieſt too, in ſome caſe: therefore he muſt have appointed ſuch an Aſſembly now, which ſhould conſiſt of many of the laity, to judge all cauſes, and the Pope too. God is not moved by any thing to act all waies in the ſame manner. *Deus vult hoc propter hoc, ſed non propter hoc vult.* God orders this to this but by this is not moved. But 2. His *ſubſtratum* here is falſe; for he ſuppoſeth here that all the ceremonies are ſet down together in one place, otherwiſe how can he upon compare ſay, much more the ſumme of points neceſſary ſhould have been ſet down *in ſome one part of theſe books*, now the cerimonies are not all ſet downe together; and now and then ſome morality is mingled with them. And ſo alſo points neceſſary may be here and there mingled with other points without any diſparagement of Gods wiſedome, 3. If he hath *particularly clearly and fully* ſet down points of ceremonie in Scripture, then how much more points neceſſary to ſalvation, *a thouſand times more importing then points of ceremonie.* But *verum prius*; for it is theirs, then the latter alſo, upon the ſame account. And ſo they may ſee how little they get by ſuch arguments. And therefore ſurely Chriſt is not obliged to his Church for credibility, but his Church to his word and ſpirit. Let "them think upon that of Chriſt St. *Iohn* the 7. 17. if any "one will do my will he ſhall know of my doctrin whether "it be of God or whether I ſpeak of my ſelfe.

And yet another *proof* you bring in that many hold that *the Epiſtles of St. Iohn were written after the Apocalypſe* &c. And what then. Is it therefore true, becauſe many hold ſo? I trow not, for then rather it ſhould not be ſo, becauſe more hold the contrary, but what would he make of it, if they had been written after the *Apocalypſe*? this. Upon this ſuppoſition the *Epiſtles* of St. *Iohn* are the laſt part of "the canon, now in this laſt part of the laſt part of the Ca

"non

"non Saint *John* saies, I have many things to write,
"but I will not with inke and penne write them but, I
"trust we shall see thee shortly and speake face to face.
Upon this, the broken matter of his discourse might for more clearencs be put into this forme, many things were written which are not set down in the canon: no man can say that those many things were unnecessary. Therefore no man can say that many things not unnecessary are not set down in the canon. Ans. We need not answer it. The ground of the major is rotten, and is to be made firm, if it could by him, that is not the order of the books. And it is not the order in the Latin; therefore this Binds them to beleive the contrary. And therefore the minor, which must suppose that suppositon must fall with it. And yet also how he minceth it, *no man can say* &c. What is this to settle us in infallibility. He might also have said better for himself, some things *not unnecessary* might be amongst those which St. *John* intended to speak to them; and this would have served his turne against us. But let them speak and prove categorically that the *Epistles* were written after the Apocalypse, and that *many things* which he would speak unto them were necessary. Otherwise *no man can say* that this argumentation concludes ought. And besides the terms *unnecessary*, might have a distinction, if it sounds as useful it is not to the point of the question: if as much as necessary: yet what he should speak to them, he should speak by the spirit of God, and let them give us such assurance for what they would adde to Scripture: then they will say somewhat. And yet again they should not surely be necessary, because *many*: for surely some things which were necessary were written; and yet those things which are certain are few, as *Tertullian* said, *Certa sunt in paucis*. Again should those *many things* have been adverse to what he had written or diverse, or the same in substance? not adverse they will say, because they say their traditions are *præter Evangelium*, not *contra*, beside the Gospel, not

contrary

contrary: if diverſe, then ſurely they did not contein things in ſubſtance neceſſary. For would Saint *John* have written ſeveral things not neceſſary, and have left to word of mouth things neceſſary when *Ebion* and *Cerinthus* vaunted ſo much of their Apoſtolical traditions. And if they were the ſame in ſubſtance, then what addition? Again if they were neceſſary how can this be reconciled to that of St. *John* the 20. 31. whereupon St. *Auſtin* and St. *Cyrill* and St. *Chryſoſtom*, it ſeems, do conclude that there was enough written which was ſufficient to faith: my third anſwer about this argument, that humane judicatories have their uſe without infalliblity, he toucheth not.

Par. 57. My fourth he toucheth in the next paragr.

In this number he ſeems, if I may think ſo to be a litle hooked, and with more line to be more ſnarled. There muſt ſtick upon the Church Roman a cenſure either of fallibility or unfaithfulneſs. Thus it is, they ſay the Scripture is not our guide ſufficiently becauſe it doth not decide controverſies, we return it to them, that upon the ſame account the Church Roman is not, becauſe it doth not decide whatſoever is neceſſary to be believed, by a full Catholique in their ſenſe. And for inſtance; whether the *Pope* hath a temporal power or not? if temporal, whether directly as the Canoniſts, or *propter bonum ſpirituale*, as others: then whether the *Pope* be ſuperiour to a Council in things Eccleſiaſtical. To theſe he gives me no poſitive account: and yet are theſe points *Cardines mundi & eccleſiæ*; the main points upon which the Church and world with them muſt turne. Do they tell us that it is a neceſſary point know whether the king be head of the Church; and is it not as neceſſary for them to know whether the *Pope* be head of the Church? But we muſt conſider his apology. *Our doctrine is that the Church can decide any point formerly revealed, when any neceſſity ſhall require it, or the declaration of this point concerne ſalvation.* Anſ. what worke would ſome adverſary have made with

him for such a return? The charge against Scripture was that it cannot end all necessary controversies. I recriminate, neither doth their Church. They reply, the Church can. I reioyn: first, here they vary, I said their Church, they say, the Church; as if they would not own the Church of Rome in its catholicknes. 2. They say it can. But if it can and will not, I am yet to seek for my truth. and as St. *Ierom* said to the *Pelagians* about the possibility of the law, how shall we think that possible which was never done? if it cannot, how is it infallible in all points? if it will not, how is it faithfull? if it can, let it do so: and then let them object our differences to us, and the inability of Scripture to end them. 3. He saies the Church can decide any point *formerly revealed*, what meanes he by this? if formerly revealed, then what need of a judge for it? and then the most they can do is to declare; and so may another Church and that not necessary neither, if it were formerly revealed. Well then. Are these points revealed or not? if they be not revealed, then by their own confession, they cannot decide them. And if they be formerly revealed, what need to be decided? but 4. *when any necessity shall require* &c. But let me know why, when such a thing is proposed by the Church it is a fundamental and a necessary point to be believed, and yet somewhat is necessary to be believed and yet not decided by the Church. As for instance, it is necessary to be believed that the *Pope* is head of the Church: for so *Bellarmin* defines a Christian with subjection to the *Pope* as head of the Church, in his Catechism. And yet it seemes this is not decided by the Church; because then it is decided whether he be supreme in Ecclesiasticals. So then the definition of the Church cannot be the adequate reason of our faith, because somewhat is necessary to be believed which is not decided; and yet again, if somewhat be necessary to be believed, then by my adversaries confession, it ought to be declared, because it doth *concern our salvation*. And

since the Church is to act not *ex arbitrio*, but *ex officio*, how can it else clear it self of the bloud of all men, as St. *Paul* doth Acts 20. 27. when it doth not declare πᾶσαν τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ, the whole counsel of God. And if they take [counsel] here in their sense, we can make use of it to them thus, that if he declared all counsels then much more necessary doctrine, because counsels, according to them, are not simply necessary, but yet it cannot be taken in their sense, because he discharged himself hereby of the bloud of all men; and therefore must it be meant of what was necessary to their salvation simply, as counsels, they say are not.

So then he thinks it the best way to pitch upon the negative, and to say, *Salvation hath very securely been had without the decision of these points you speak of. If Circumstances happen that salvation cannot be had without their decision, they will then be decided.* Ans. first then, let there be a defalcation and discounting of one point from the number of those which are accounted by them to us necessary, which the Scripture hath not decided, and that is whether the *King* be head of the Church, for surely there is as much reason of necessity to salvation for them to know whether the *Pope* be head of the Church, as for us to know whether the *King* be head; and more too since infallibility is annexed to their head. 2. If Salvation may be had without an assurance in those points, then how shall we be bound to the *Trent* Council in belief of the Roman Church to be the Apostolick Church, without which no salvation, when yet we need not know who is supreme in that Church? Take it in this forme, subjection to the universal Church is necessary to salvation, the Roman Church is not universal unles he be head, therefore unles he be head of the Church, subjection to the Roman Church is not necessary to salvation. And then *Conclamatum est*. And if *Circumstances*, according to him, can bring these points under a necessity of decision, then it seems they are but indifferent *ex naturâ rei*, for circumstances are only considerable

rable in case of indifferency. And then by the virtue of the former discourse, it is indifferent to salvation whether we be subject to the Roman Church or not. And so might we end the business.

But he goes on, *if you acknowledge a recall necessity to be at all times of the infallible knowledge of these points.* Anſ. He doth not take notice that I dispute with him upon his own principles, by which he he is bound to shew that the Church hath defined these points; since he saies the Scripture hath not decided all necessary points, but hath referred us to the Church for their decision. Now then since these points are not necessary to us, but to them who have that opinion of the Roman Church, it belongs to them to shew the Church's decision of these points. And therefore if *they believe all Scripture*, and therefore these, (if they be determined there) this will not serve them, though it is enough for us; because what the Scripture doth not clearly define, they say the Church by Scripture is deputed to. And if the Church hath not done it, though they know the way to *Rome*, they do not know the way to heaven, and so all his *arguments fall of themselves.*

That which he saies he addes that *our whole Church teacheth the definitions of Councils confirmed to be infallible*, how little hath it in it: their *whole Church* if they take it for the universal Church, it is but a part, either in quantity or dominion. If they mean it not as the universal Church, then we may say as well our whole Church teacheth that they are not infallible, nay nor did the former Councils themselves account themselves infallible. But 2. [Councils confirmed] by whom confirmed? why do they not here speak out? for in other places, where this is not actually contested, they will say that they are to be confirmed by the *Pope*. But why then are they so loath to end the controversie upon which side the superiority should be cast upon the council or upon the *Pope*? for if the councils are to be confirmed by the *Pope*, then they have their *esse*

*Constitutivum* from him, and then *ἐν παραλλήλοις* he must have the superiority; notwithstanding what the Council of *Basil* and *Constance* determined. But I can demonstrate that no *Circumstances* will ever be sufficient to give occasion to this decision. All points are to be decided by *Councils confirmed*, now the councils will never vote the superiority of the *Pope*, nor the *Pope* confirm the superiority of the Council. Therefore it will never be decided. Let them therefore *submit* to Scripture, which their *Church obligeth* them *to believe*. And let them hereafter think better of the Scriptures sufficiency, since in such points the Church Roman cannot or will not or dare not supply its supposed defects. And they shall *find it not to leave them ignorant of what is necessary for them to know*: *to cavill at it*, they *will pretend that to be necessary which* they *will say the next moment not to be* necessary. They call for a decision by Scripture of the question whether a King be head of the Church, as of a necessary point, and now they deny the question to be necessary, of the *Pope*.

N. 58. Herein he would reinforce his argument to prove us contrary to Scripture in not receiving extreme unction, as a Sacrament upon the command of St. *James*, 5. 13, 14, 15. ver. first he declaimes upon our denial of their interpretation. And then would urge it upon compare of the claritude of this text for them with the cleatenes of other texts produced for us. Let them answer our texts as we answer theirs, and not only say that one is as clear as the other.

Well, but he saies now, *How clear that place is, appears by the very letter, in which we have all we can desire to make a Sacrament; a visible signe of an invisible grace.* Ans. every Sacrament of proper name is a visible signe of an invisible grace: but every visible signe of an invisible grace is not a Sacrament of proper name, unles it hath Christs institution. And therefore must we referre it to the use of healing, spoken of St. *Marke* the 6, 13, which it seems,

seems, continued some time. Epoch. 9. Anthol. 30. *gifts of healing.*

Yet he supposes that the Scripture hath decided this point for them. Hereupon, we call upon him, "If the Scripture hath decided this point, then the Scripture can judge and end controversies. To this he replies by asking, whether it therefore follows, that it can end *all necessary controversies*, because it can end *this one controversie*. We reioyne, that it doth not follow *ex vi formæ*, that because it can do one, it can do all. But yet it may follow *ex vi materiæ*, thus; if it can decide this which is a necessary matter, why not all such? since especially they confess this Sacrament is not so necessary, as some other, because it is but a casuall Sacrament. And the Sacrament of penance may supply the use of it. But 2. The use which we make of his former concession as it seems, that the Scripture had decided this point, is in order to the act more then the object. For hereby we see that the Scripture can decide a point, which by them is wont to be allowed onely to a living judge: now it is true *ex parte rei*, if it can decide one, it can decide another, for the cheif incapacity of the Scriptures not deciding controversies is urged in reference to the act; and therefore a living judge is by them substituted for this capacity.

But he saies, *again is this controversie by this text ended? do you not still stand out in the contrary opinion.* Ans. This doth not hinder the controversie to be ended, because we are not convinced. It is possible for them to be convinced of some points which they will not profess. It is possible for some points to be clear, which they are not convinced of; conviction therefore is not the measure of decision. For by this argument the *Trent* Council had with us and the French ended no controversies: because we are not convinced thereby. And therefore we are not to be guided by them, because they cannot end our controversies. And if they say the Council is furnished with

sufficient

ſufficient aſſiſtance of the ſpirit, which may be apt to convince: ſurely we can ſay that the Scripture is more apt to convince, becauſe there is no queſtion made of its being written by inſpiration. So then we cannot ſay, that the point of extreme unction is not decided, becauſe we are not convinced; but we can ſay that we are not convinced, becauſe it is not decided. But alſo we muſt note to them from hence that it ſeems we muſt be perſwaded in matters of beliefe by the Holy Ghoſt, ſince texts which they ſuppoſe ſo clear, do not convince. Moreover he ſaies, *your ſecond anſwer is flatly againſt the Text, for you ſay theſe words do onely relate to the gift of healing in theſe daies; and the Scripture ſaith they have alſo a relation to the healing of the ſoul,* &c. If he hath committed ſinnes they ſhall be forgiven him. And *Qui ad puncta reſpicit de facili pronunciat.* He doth not take notice that the healing of the ſoul hath relation to the *prayer of Faith*, unleſs *Eſtius* and the *Rhemiſts* can indeed prove that the *Prayer of Faith* is the forme of the Sacrament. Secondly, whereas he blames me for referring this to the gift of healing, let him retract that blame for the Council of *Trents* ſake, which in the 14 ſeſſion, for want likely of other Texts to prove Chriſt's inſtitution of this Sacrament, will have it inſinuated by St. *Mark*; which ſurely can be onely in the 6.ch. where it refers to the gift of healing. And there they may ſee that the Elders did cure by anointing with oyle: which he demands a Text for. And they did it *commonly* in reſpect of frequency, though not commonly, *quoad modum effectus*. Therefore may we ſee by this, that the *Trent* Council could erre (and if that, other Councils, they may think) in its peremptory determination of this point, *Si quis dixerit extremam unctionem non eſſe vere & proprie ſacramentum, & a beato Iacobo Apoſtolo promulgatum; ſed ritum tantum acceptum a patribus, aut figmentum humanum, Anathema ſit.* If any one ſhall ſay that extreme unction is not truly and properly a Sacrament promulged by the bleſſed Apoſtle St. *James*, but a rite taken from

from the fathers; or to be an humane figment, let him be Anathema. Neither did Christ institute it, nor St. *James* promulge it; not did the fathers, it seems, take it for a Sacrament. So, as it was said of *Origen*, *magnum suum facit ecclesiæ Sacramenta*: so do these men out of their own wit make Sacraments of the Church. Only *Origen* made mysteries of the Church, as the word is taken largely: these make Sacraments, as the word is taken strictly. And surely they are hard put to it to attribute that thing to the Sacrament, which is attributed to prayer, which is therefore so much Commended by the Apostle in the following verse.

To take notice here of that which is new, He hereupon N. 59.
frames the clearness of that Text (this is my body) with the clearness of these Texts I produced for the Sunday and Baptism of Infants.

He adds, *they are words expressed by four several writers of the Scripture without any intimation of their being spoken figuratively.* Ans. We have produced some Texts for the observation of the Lords day and for Baptism of Infants, without any figure: therefore our Texts may upon this account be as clear. Secondly, If the sense of this Text be so clear, why did not the Ages of the Church urge it before the Lateran Council? were they all also blind? as they must be, if the Text was so clear in their sense. And Thirdly, If the Text so clear of it self, what need to confer it with the sixth of St. *John*, and if they would confer Texts they might find more against them in the points of difference. But what will they say if the sixth of St. *John* speaks not of Sacramental eating? For if so, how can the 53. ver. be understood: for then Infants (unless they are to have the Communion, as anciently) and the Thief upon the Cross, and all in time of Persecution which died without the Sacrament, are damned, but as they know, they are not all of a mind in this; for *Cressy* thinks the Chap. is not to be taken of the Sacrament, and *Bellarmine* will find us

more

dance of this perswasion, as *Gabriel*, and *Cusanus*, and *Capistran*, and *Tapperus*, and *Hesselius*, and *Lansenius*, in his 4th. b. *de Sacramento Euch. Cap.* 5. and they have good reason to exempt this Chap. from this use, because it speaks as plainly of the Cup.

Therefore let them consider what hath been said before upon this point, and then let them referre the issue to compare betwixt the clearness of texts for them in points of difference, and of texts for us as to things necessary. But this should have been the state of the question.

That contradiction he makes by the shift is not yet well answered. He said in the former paper that the words are clear in this Sacrament, and yet also that the Scripture doth not decide this point. Upon this I said, how farre is this from a contradiction. He saies now, that *this doth arise out of my speaking according to your principles*. And He was much mistaken, if he thought I could be thus deserved with a supposal of his own consequence for one of my principles. He would cavill thus; this text which he brings is more clear for him, then those I bring are clear for me. Then if my texts less clear for me do prove my points, those texts more clear for him do prove his texts. But we say the texts he brings are not so clear for him as they are clear against him; and therefore how can he proceed upon our principles.

And yet again he saies, *and again you saying the other side by their texts are clearer then yours, this controversie is manifestly decided, therefore I must consequently say that according to your controversie the Scripture doth not decide.*

Ans. Some are blamed for charging upon opinions remote consequences but he chargeth me with a consequence of his opinion, because he thinks his texts more clear for him then mine for me. I must needs also say so, for else him from inconvenience, surely we can hold our principles better then he would make them. And yet once more he will play the Sophister *it is according to your principles that these texts must*

be

*be clear becauſe they be clearer then thoſe which you are forced to affirm clear. And again you muſt ſay that they are not clear for fear you ſhould confeſs them to decide againſt you.* Anſ. This harpes upon the ſame ſtring, he ſuppoſeth me a Captive to his conſequences upon his own opinion. My principle is good, that points neceſſary are clearly ſet down in Scripture: but his aſſumption is not right that his texts are more clear then mine. this I demand the proof of. If I were bound by my principles or his diſcourſe to confeſs that his texts were clearer then mine; he would ſay ſomewhat: but *falſum priùs.* And yet this is fairely returnable to him, he is bound by the condition of their principles to ſay that their texts are clear for him (and yet they are not ſo clear for him as they are againſt him) becauſe they have neither reaſon nor Antiquity for their ſenſe: and yet muſt ſay again that the text hath not decided this point, for feare it ſhould be able to decide controverſies.

And now he draws up again, *now if theſe two places be denied to be clear with clarity ſufficient to put an end to the controverſie, then according to my principles, ſcarce any controverſie will be decided by any text.* Anſ. He hath ſeen the reaſons why thoſe texts muſt be denied to bear his ſenſe and whether he hath as well cleared my texts for things neceſſary to be conteined plainly in Scripture, let thoſe judge, whoſe intereſs it is not, to be Judges. To ſuch I ſay, τὰ ἐντὸς ἐμοὶ ἐξέτασον 2. He doth very ill to argue from his conceit to an impoſſibility in the thing; as if, if theſe texts did not clearly ſpeak this his ſenſe, no controverſie could be determined by any text. *A non eſſe ad non poſſe non valet.* He might have known that the Nicene Fathers determined the Coeſſentiality of the Son of God by Scripture and that *Bellarmin* concludes againſt the *Anabaptiſts* by Scripture. And that the *Trent* Council, I hope, concluded extreme unction by Scripture: ſo that it lay in Scripture clearly determined, as in *actu ſignato*: the Council did but call it out and ſhew it to the people.

3. He ſhould have ſaid [*according* to his purpoſe] *ſcarſe any controverſie can then be determined by Scripture*: for ſpeculative principles may yeild more then ingagements. Perſons will ever plead diſſatisfaction, though the Judgement within be convinced. And 3. Others of his religion are not in this of his perſwaſion: for they will not ſo lightly give over the determinability of other points by Scripture. And yet I commend alſo his modeſty in that he ſaies not abſolutely no controverſie, but *ſcarſe any controverſie*. So that it is not repugnant to a controverſie *Ex natura rei* to be determined by Scripture. And then there is no ſuch neceſſity of a living Judge, ſurely the living Judge is more neceſſary for the ſtate of *Rome* than for our ſalvation.

Then he takes exceptions at my diſcourſe about the nature of a ſacrament. He tells me, *you do not do it as you ſhould have been done to the preſent purpoſe; to wit by alleadging more clear texts to prove that Chriſts true body is not really in the Sacrament, then I alleadge to prove that it was really in it.* Anſ. But firſt they may thinke that we dounderſtand our ſelves ſufficiently in this caſe, not to be bound to give any texts for the negative. And therefore ſince they affirme they ſhould prove ſo ſtrongly that nothing can be anſwered: and ſince they challenge, they ſhould make clear work as they gee; we ſufficiently diſcharge our parts in the taking away their arguments, which concludes to us and might to them the negative, and ſince the ſignal texts for their cauſe in this point, are anſwered we have no more to do. 2. Such a demand will return upon him; I have reaſon to doubt of his Interpretation of the text of St. *James* lately agitated. I ſay alſo, give me a clearer text againſt my ſenſe which I make of it, namely as relating to the gift of healing. Is not this as equall a demand, ſince eſpecially the council could not, it ſeems, fetch their ſenſe from tradition? 3. If Chriſt's being really in the Sacrament would ſatisfie them without determination of the

the manner, this controverſie would be at an end: for we ſay as antiently, *Præſentiam agnoſcimus, modum neſcimus*, but, forſooth, they muſt appoint the manner of preſence, and yet cannot agree about the manner of converſion of the Element into the body. 4. What need of any texts againſt their ſenſe, when the ſenſe imports that which cannot be? although the Canoniſts do flatter the *Pope* with all kind of power: yet one ſaid well of him, *Papa non poteſt facere de quadrato rotundum.* Nay, as *Aquinas* determins handſomely concerning thoſe things which are in queſtion whether God can do, it ſhould rather be ſaid that they cannot be done, then that God cannot do them. So this cannot be. For it implies a contradiction, yea many, as it is noted. It implies the body not to be when it is. If the body be to be made then it is not: for the terme of motion cannot be exiſtent before the motion be accompliſhed. So then it is, namely in Heaven: and yet muſt not be, becauſe it is to be made on Earth by the Prieſt. And yet fiftly. If he would not make an ill uſe of a courteſie, we might gratifie this humor a little; and tell him that there is a Text in the 1 Ep. to the *Cor.* 11. 26. which concludes clearly againſt his ſenſe, for it is ſaid, "you ſhew the Lords death till he come. If it be done in remembrance, how is he corporally preſent? And now me thinks then they ſhould be obliged to anſwer my Texts for my ſenſe againſt their ſenſe: ſince indeed their ſenſe is non-ſence.

Here he comes over again (to make the work more tedi- N. 60.
ous) with ſome paſſages of the Athanaſian Creed, which he thinks every one is bound explicitly to believe (though they think an implicit faith ſufficient to them) and yet they are not clearly ſet down in Scripture. To this I anſwered that the matter of them in the generality is found according to equivalence in Scripture although it be not found in terms. Only they are deſired to conſider that this anſwer was made to the other paſſages of the Athanaſian Creed,

and not to the conſubſtantiality of the Son of God: for this is more expreſly ſpoken of as I have told them; but becauſe he would not be urged to a neceſſity of anſwering what I ſaid diſtinctly about this point, he includes it amongſt other paſſages of the Creed: it may be upon theſe accounts: that it might ſeem to be under no more neceſſity of actual belief than the other; and Secondly, might loſe the uſe of a proper anſwer, and he might have leſs to do by anſwering it in common, but we are not ignorant of his devices.

My anſwer therefore to the properties of the divine perſons in the H. Trinity is yet in full vigour and force, that the matter of them is as well found in Scripture, (though not in termes, yet according to equivalence) as their tranſubſtantiation.

To this he ſaies now, *To be as clearely ſet down as Tranſubſtantiation, in Scripture, is (according to your own principles) not to be clearly ſet down at all.* Anſ. Again he playes the Sophiſter in taking that to be ſpoken *ad rem*, which was ſpoken *ad hominem*. Therefore cannot he conclude that there is an equall independency of both on Scripture to be inferred from my words. They hold tranſubſtantiation ſo upon Scripture; I not. But I make uſe of their diſtinction, as to this point, againſt them, for thoſe paſſages in the Athanaſian Creed.

Neither is it any boot for him to ſay, *It is not more ſatisfactorie, if you mean to argue out of our own principles; for according to us, all points neceſſary, (and this point in particular) are not clearly ſet down in Scripture, and to prove this I have laboured all the Chap.* So then, thus we know *Ulyſſes*. They will make the beſt proof of their points they can by Scripture: but they make a better uſe of Scriptures by their obſcurity; that ſo cauſes might neceſſarily fall into the hands of the Romans. Firſt then, this *μέτρον* we have by them, that they dare not ſtand to Scripture for the determination of their points, and they may know who thoſe were which were *Lucifugæ Scripturarum*. Therefore I hope, we

ſhall

ſhall have leave to make the ſhorter work by abatement of diſcourſe out of Scripture. For when you produce Scripture for your cauſe, we can retort your own confeſſion, this point is not clear in Scripture. Having then beaten them out of the hold of the Fathers, & now out of the hold of the Scriptures, we may have done enough. But ſecondly, to give them a little more chaſe, though they will not make Scripture a Principle; yet ſince they will make it a proof for their auctoraments, we can ſay as well as they can prove this point by Scriptures; ſo is the Athanaſian Creed as provable by Scripture, as to thoſe paſſages about the properties of the divine perſons. And now might I name *Boucher*, who in his *Mir veilles de Deiu*, hath the ſame diſtinction in the point of tranſubſtantiation, that though it be not found in Scripture in the term, yet according to equivalence. But what ſaith *Bellarmin* in his 3. b. *de ſacr. Euch. cap.* 23. *Etiamſi Scriptura quam ſupra adduximus videatur nobis tam clara ut poſſit cogere hominem, non protervum, tamen an ita ſit, merito dubitari poteſt.* So then the Scripture ſeems to him to be in this point ſo clear that it might compel a man not pertinacious. Yet he muſt needs ſpill the milk he gives, leſt we ſhould come no more to the Roman Cow. But if a Scripture may be ſo clear to them in a point of controverſie: why not to us, in points neceſſary? Yea the *Trent* Counſel goes further in their 13 Seſs. They ſay the words do carry before them that proper and moſt open ſignification, *propiam illam & apertiſſimam ſignificationem præ ſe ferunt*. And I hope they carried a plain and moſt open ſignification did they not? if they did not, then here is a falſity to the Councils Declaration, if they did; ſo may Scripture have a plain and moſt open ſignification in points of faith. Again if the Sacrament of extreme unction was determined by the *Trent* Counſel with reſpect to Scripture, as before, why ſhould we not ſtand to Scripture in other points?

And this may be ſufficient out of their own principles. And as for our own principles, as to the queſtion about the properties

properties of the Divine Persons, we need not labour therein. For if we hold that all things necessary are plainly set down in Scripture: then it is consequent hereunto, that the truth of those properties is no more necessary to be believed than according to what clearness they are delivered in by Scripture. And then Secondly, to answer to the point it self, those opposite relations, as *Aquinas* calleth them, whereby the H. persons are distinguished in their personalities, do connotate themselves sufficiently. For the Father being the first Person, must be of himself; the Son, as such, must be begotten. The H. Ghost, since there is but one only Son, as is plain in Scripture, must not be begotten: but proceeds; which is the expression of Scripthere. Indeed there is a question whether the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son. But as to this we need not consult the antient reading of the Athanasian Creed; if the Mr. of the sentences may be believed, who thinks there is not so vast a difference, as that either part did destroy salvation. And if it be absolutely necessary to believe as the Roman Church in this point, why could not Pope *Urban* see the truth hereof in the dispute with the Greeks about it, as well as our Anselm? Why did he bring him into the Lists with this Preface, *Includamus hunc in orbe nostro tanquam alterius orbis papam?* And surely it seems to be as possible for the unlearned people to be saved without a positive faith herein, as it was for the learned Greeks in a positive difference: unless our adversaries will damn them all who hold not with them herein. He goes on, *your second answer is destroyed by the former.* Answ. Yes surely if our adversaries are to be our judges, we need not *hold* our *articles* which we hold necessary, *upon the authority of the Church*, but upon clear Texts; and clearer Texts too, than they have for their transubstantiation or authority of the Church.

But to the main matter of my answer he makes no return. "I said, although we believe what is said in (*Athana-*

" (*Athanaſius*) his creed, yet therefore we are not bound " to believe it upon the Authority of the Church, ſince he " would have believed it though the Church had not; as " he did ſometimes differ from the common profeſſion of " the Church in the conſubſtantiality of the ſonne of God. And what ſaies he to this? nothing. And beſides the Authority of the Church hath not it ſelfe equally to the paſſages in the Creed and to tranſubſtantiation. And therefore *Scotus* ſaid that this tranſubſtantiation was no *dogma fidei* before the *Lateran* Council, as *Bellarmin* ſaies in his 3. *b. de ſacram. Euch.* 23. *ch.* For as for the conſent of the Fathers (which he ſaies he did non read) ſurely *Scotus* did very well know what it was; ſince the conſent of the Fathers is by the Schoolemen laid for the foundation of ſchool-Divinity. It remaineth therefore that both my anſwers may be good according to both principles.

Another inſtance of things neceſſary not clearly taught by Scripture, he does here re-urge, namely Baptiſm of Infants. And here he names my anſwer, that *it is not neceſſary for the Salvation of the Children to be baptized.* But here I diſtinguiſhed of a neceſſity of præcept and a neceſſity of mean, the former we granted: the latter we denied, " ſo as that if it be not baptized, it is undoubtedly damned. Theſe words do make my ſenſe to be underſtood againſt an abſolute neceſſity, without which no poſſibility of Salvation. To prove this, I brought the Text St. *Marke* the 16. 6. " He that believeth and is baptized ſhall be ſaved: " but he that believeteh not ſhall be damned. now, this Text, he ſaith, *ſpeaketh nothing of Children.* And this gloſs he gives upon the latter part of that Text *He that believeth not, and conſequently would poſitively not be baptized ſhall be damned.* Anſ. He trifles. I acknowledge that the Text ſpeaks not of Infants: for the drift of my diſcourſe upon this Text was otherwiſe, namely upon the caſe of thoſe of age. And my argument did runne upon advantage, thus; if the H. Gh. Did not reduplicate damnation upon defect N. 61.

of

of baptiſm to thoſe of age, then much leſs reaſon is there to exclude Infants from Salvation, who may have baptiſm in *re* but in *voto* not, as they ſpeak. This was the effect of my diſcourſe let the point come to the pinch. Though they do believe yet ſhould they have the ſeale of faith: but if they do not believe, damnation here proceeds not upon defect of baptiſm, but upon defect of faith, which if *Bellarmin* had conſidered, he would not have annexed Salvation imediately to baptiſm in his 2. *b. de ef. ſacr. c.* 3. And not to faith but as a diſpoſition to baptiſm. 2. All poſitive refuſal of baptiſm makes a defect of baptiſm: but all defect of baptiſm doth not make even in thoſe of age a refuſal thereof. Now it is *caſus dabilis*, that one of age may believe, and yet may not have baptiſm, as the neceſſity may fall out. Shall this man be damned though he hath faith, becauſe he hath not baptiſm, which he could not have? and this was the caſe which the Martyr that on a ſuddain, when one of the forty ſhrunke, ſtepped in and made up the number, as St. *Baſil* relates it, he believed and was not Baptized. What was he damned? no, they will ſay he had baptiſm in *voto*, and the baptiſm of bloud. Well, but if there were an abſolute neceſſity of baptiſm as there is of faith he muſt have been damned notwithſtanding, abſolute neceſſity knowes no diſpenſations.

But therefore he produceth a Text for abſolute neceſſity, St. *Iohn* the 3. 5. "Except a man be borne of water and "of the ſpirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdome of hea- "ven. Anſ. If we compare this verſe with the third, we need not make any other conſtruction then of a neceſſity of being born from above. Neither is it likely that Chriſt would have ſpoken no otherwiſe to *Nicodemus* of baptiſm, had he meant it ſo. And *Ferus*, though he ſpeaks of this ſenſe *ad literam*; yet hath he other ſenſes thereof. And if it be compared with the other Text St. *Matthew* 3. 11. you ſhall be baptized with the Holy Ghoſt and with fire;

as

as that Text is to be understood by an Ἐν διὰ δυοῖν so may this also, notwithstanding the order of the words. But 2. *Dato, non concesso*, that it is to be understood of Baptismal water, yet the Rhemists upon the place do confess that in two cases Baptismal water is not necessary. Namely in the case of martyrdome; and if they have a desire of it, but are prevented necessarily by death. And the reason thereof is sufficient, *because God hath not bound his grace in respect of his own freedome, to the Sacraments.* and so *Ferus* upon the place, *Deus enim non alligavit potentiam suam Sacramentis* &c. God hath not tied his own power to the Sacraments. By his ordinate will indeed he gives grace by the Sacraments: But nevertheles he can give it without the Sacrament. Let them then tell me why Infants may not have *rem Sacramenti*, without the seale: as if God should have no favour for Infants, because they cannot be qualified for the priviledge. Let then the Rhemists and *Ferus* be compurgators for the *pernicious doctrine* of mine as he calls it. And now whatsoever testimony he produceth of the necessity of baptism; (unles St. *Austin's*, as to Infants) they will stand very well with my termes in their ordinary sense; which doth not contradict an ordinary necessity of it to Infants: but again that all the Fathers were of this opinion I can deny. I except *Tertullian*. And St. *Austin* for those of age, holdes but an ordinary necessity; as appears in his 4. *b. De Bapt. Contra Donat.* 23. *ch.* This ordinary necessity I stand for. He himself intends no more by his testimonies, Dr. *Tayler's* and others, and therefore he absolves me himself: but I cannot absolve him from ignorance in the Elench. This doth not contradict me, who do dispute now against an absolute necessity: which he must maintain; or else in this he comes short of his design. And also that that allowance of baptism of Infants (after it be done) doth not inferre an absolute necessity of their being damned (in the judgment of the Fathers) if they were not Baptized; if they will take Mr. *Hookers* opinion

for all, let them conſult him in his 5. b. 33. p. where he ſaith "I know there are many ſentences found in the "books and writings of the antient Fathers to prove both "Eccleſiaſtical and Moral defects in the Miniſters of Bap-"tiſm a bar to the heavenly benefit thereof. Now in *Laymen*, I trow, there are Eccleſiaſtical defects: for there is a defect in not being Eccleſiaſtical. And therefore whether others miſtake the Fathers, either in the point of fact, or in the reaſon of that allowance, *ουκ ἐμὸν ὁ δικαιῶ*.

But he gives me a Syllogiſm, which we will not neglect, becauſe it is very rare with him. He diſputes upon my diſtinction of neceſſity, thus; *This precept is neceſſarily to be fulfilled, this precept is not plainly ſet down in Scripture: therefore all neceſſary points are not plainly ſet down in Scripture.* This hath the face but not the form of a Syllogiſm. But to paſs that, we anſwer therefore that this Syllogiſm doth not conclude contradictorily to the ſtate of the queſtion, which is whether all things neceſſary to ſalvation are plainly ſet down in Scripture. Now all that is neceſſary to be done is larger then all that is neceſſary to be done unto Salvation. Though all things neceſſary to be done unto Salvation, are neceſſary to be done: yet all that is neceſſary to be done, is not neceſſary to be done unto Salvation. The former are neceſſary *neceſſitate medii*: the latter *neceſſitate præcepti*. Now the knowledg of the former is ſimply neceſſary: the knowledg of the latter is not ſo neceſſary. Whatſoever is known to be præcepted is to be neceſſarily done: but whatſoever is præcepted, is not neceſſary to be known. So that alſo his Syllogiſm was peccant in the fallacie of the conſequent.

He followes me then, your *Anſwer will not helpe you out here, whatſoever is neceſſarily inferred from the Scriptures is binding in the vertue of the principles*, why ſo? *becauſe he ſaies, becauſe you cannot ſhew that this precept given to the parents is neceſſarily inferred out of Scripture.* So now he is upon the minor of the former Syllogiſm: he would then prove it by

a

a negative Induction. *Not out of the Inſtitution of our Saviour; for he alſo inſtituted the Sacrament of the Euchariſt, not neceſſary for Infants.* Anſ. firſt this is no argument; it doth not follow from the denial of one ſpecies to another: becauſe he did not inſtitute the Euchariſt as neceſſary for infants; threfore he did not inſtitute the Sacrament of baptiſm as neceſſary for Infants. 2. they know there is not the ſame reaſon for the Inſtitution of the Euchariſt for Infants as for the Inſtitution of baptiſm. For this is adminiſtred to the child without its own faith; the other is adminiſtred upon faith to confirmation. 3. If they will be ruled by tradition and the authority of the Church; the Euchariſt was accounted alſo as neceſſary for Infants. Now that tradition came from Chriſt as his inſtitution or not, if it did, then there is ſome reaſon for baptiſm to Infants: if not, how ſhall we believe tradition or the authority of the Church.

He proceeds, *not out of ſubſtitution to Circumciſion: for ſo it ſhould not be neceſſary to women.* To be even with them, The high Prieſt was only of males: the *Pope* ſucceeds the high Prieſt: therefore the Popedome was not competible to *Ioane*: ſome of them would fain have ſomewhat for woman to be proportionable to Circumciſion of males towards the taking away of original ſinne, which ſhould be an object of tradition; But as the unmarried was included in the parent; ſo the woman included under her huſband, as to this.

Yet ſuch another argument we have, then it ſhould be neceſſary only for thoſe *of the Iewiſh nation.* As if Circumciſion was inioyned to the *Iew* upon the *quatenus* of the nation, and not as they were members of the Church, under the ſame Covenant with Chriſtians, as to the ſubſtance thereof: and therefore *Euſebius* ſaies of ſome of thoſe under the law, that they were χριστιανοι though not ὀνομα they were reall Chriſtians, or in effect Chriſtians, though not in denomination.

That which followes was caſt in by me *ex abundanti*, and not as ſuch a decretory argument, namely, "beſides what "may be ſuppoſed by the baptiſm of whole families. And "therefore he needed not to have ſaid, *it is no evident conſequence.* It was never intended for ſuch. *Valeat quantum valere poteſt.* And yet if it be as probable or more that in all thoſe families complexively there were ſome at leaſt, if but one or two Infants, this conſequence, I think I may ſay, is better then any they have given us to prove their infallibility.

At the end of this number he ſaies, *I inſiſt not upon the authorities I alledged out of St.* Auſtin, *St.* Chryſ. *becauſe I deal with one who little regards authority confeſſed to be the Fathers.* Anſ. He might firſt have anſwered what I ſaid to his citation of St. *Auſtin.* but it ſeems by his neglect either that the Fathers are not for him or he not for the Fathers; or indeed both; and the latter becauſe the former. He is not for the Fathers becauſe they are not for him. And let them conſider that of St. *Auſtin* in his 4. *b. de Bap. contra Don.* 28. *ch. Tamen veraciter conjicere poſſumus quid valeat in parvulis baptiſmi Sacramentum ex circumciſione carnis quam prior populus accepit.* Notwithſtanding we may truly gueſſe what the Sacrament of Baptiſm does avail in infants out of the circumciſion of the fleſh, which the former people received. And *Bellarmin* muſt think Scripture good againſt Anabaptiſts, but not for us againſt them, who make better uſe of it as a tradition.

N. 62. And now to make an end of his *long Chap.* as he ſaies himſelf (and I ſay ſo too, but it might have been made ſhorter by him by halfe) he ſaies he concludes, as I would have him, namely that *theſe points were and ought to be determined by the Church upon neceſſity of Salvation.* He ſaies now, This I prove by this argument, *This point and all the former are neceſſary to be believed with an infallible aſſent, but we cannot believe any point with an infallible aſſent unleſs it be determined by infallible authority. And the authority of the Scripture hath*

not

*not determined these points*; then since no other *infallible authority can be found on Earth, if we deny the authority of the Church to be infallible, her authority must needs be infallible.* Ans. after a long chap. to make his word good, he makes as long an argument which might have been put into two lines. But part of his book was to be length. But we answer in short first to the major proposition; if he meanes when they are believed they are to be believed with an infallible assent, we grant it; or when they are clearely proposed, are so to be believed, we grant it: but if he means it thus, that this point and all the former are necessary to be believed with an infallible assent, upon necessity of Salvation, it is denied. And he hath not nor can prove it: 2. As to his assuming that the authority of the Scriptures hath not determined these points; we say first that so farre as they are necessary, they are determined in Scripture. And 2. they are not so clearly determined in Scripture, because they are not so necessary. And yet we may say as *St. Austin* in such a case about intellectuall vision *lib.*12 *de gen ad literam cap.* 25, *Aliud est errare in his quæ videt, aliud errare quia non videt.* We do not erre in seing them in Scriptures, but we do erre because we do not see them. To end then, *Scotus* proposeth this question, *utrùm cognitio supernaturalis necessaria, viatori sit sufficienter tradita in Sacra Scriptura*; whether supernaturall knowledg necessary to a Travailler be sufficiently delivered in the Holy Scripture, and he concludes affirmatively. And so may we. 3. And for overplus, if these points were necessary to be referred to the determination of the *Church*, we could easily (*dato non concesso*) remove them from the Roman Court; and try them by the universal Church of all places and times; with which universal Church the Roman is not converted, and by which it is not like to be converted

As Mr. *Hooker* notes.

CHAP.

## CHAP. IV.

### The *Church is not an infallible* Iudge.

*The first Number is a Preface depending upon hopes of the former discourse: But to this we say nothing, save only that they shall never be rewarded for such hope, unless they can prove their word to be the Word of God.*

FIrst *those words Matthew* 16. 19. *spoken to St.* Peter, *upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it, allow the Church a security from ever admitting any doctrine so pernicious, that the gates of hell may prevaile against her.* Ans. first though these words were spoken to St. *Peter*, yet it doth not hence follow that they were spoken of St. *Peter* exclusively to the rest. And then the Fathers, as before, understood it of his faith, not of his person: and of his faith objectively, not subjectively. And then 3. this respects not only the Church repræsentative, but the Church formall, against which principally the gates of hell do not prevaile; and so the words runne handsomly for the Church, that the words *allow the Church security from ever admitting any doctrine so pernicious, that the gates of hell may prevaile against her.* And therefore upon these considerations, we flatly deny to him the following words, *that this promise made to the Church is that which mainely makes for my purpose*, and surely that which follows makes

makes for us, and may be a fourth answer to the former words; *whether the Church be built upon St. Peter and his successours, or upon the faith of St. Peter, is not the thing I chiefely aime at: my aime is to find a Church built on a rock so strong that no errour shall ever overthrow it.* So then if we assume that the invisible Church is such, we are agreed. Only my adversary seems to have more mind to retreat then to retract. But my adversary will have it to be understood of the representative Church, because he saies; he is now assured *the Church shall never be a nest of errours, idolatrous, superstitious; wickedly assuming the authority of an infallible Tribunal without sufficient warrant: all or any of those things would bring her to the gates of hell; they being all damnable impieties.* Ans. Now we shall see that this makes not for him. He was for the Roman Church; was he not? And yet will not here meddle how this concerns the Roman Church. then how doth this make for him? In the former treatise of his, this Text was meant of St. *Peter* and his successours: and now he will not meddle with what concernes St. *Peter* or his successours. Will these things here be reconciled till *Tisbie* comes? 2. This makes for me; not only that he is not willing, as it seems, to stand his ground (which *Bellarmin*, and *Peron* and the Rhemists stand upon) but also because the *promise* is made to the Catholique Church. Thus then, their Church is not the Catholique Church: the promise is made to the Catholique Church, therefore not to them. The Roman Church may be a nest of errours, idolatrous, superstitious, wickedly assuming the authority of an infallible Tribunal without sufficient authority; though the Catholique Church be not such, nor doth assume such authority; as the errours of a particular Church are not charged duly upon the universal Church; so the privileges of the universal Church are not infeoffed upon a particular.

Well, but now we will do as he bids us and be patient till he *shew in the next chapter*, how this concernes the *Roman* Church

*Church.* But shall I have my five answers answered then; for he saies here that I *begin to say nothing against* him *until I begin to say sixthly.* So then I must be thought to say nothing against him, because he hath nothing to say to what I said in those five answers.

The sixth answer then he takes notice of, and it came in thus; he had asserted the Church secure from *all damnative errour.* I took upon advantage this, as taking those words distinctively; that though it was not free from all errour yet from errour damnative. And I gave him good reason why he should take those words so, because, otherwise they are not like to be the Church, unto which that priviledge is granted. Upon this I argued against their infallibility, according to the opinion also of Mr. *Knot.* Therefore he now waves this debate, and saies he argued *ad hominem*; but we will hunt him out of this refuge too. They cannot argue thus out of our principles, because we say this of the universal Church; not of a particular Church. No Church of one denomination is secure from damnative errour, therefore cannot they ultimately improve, what we grant to the universal Church, for their use. But 2. He could not yet from hence conclude that *no body shall be damned for following the guidance of the Church.* For not to say again that this is not appliable to the Roman Church, which is not the Catholique Church: yet may we not follow the universal Church absolutely, because it is not in all points infallible. For so consequently, we might be bound to follow errour. Yea 3. Since according to our principles it is not exempted from all errour; according to Mr. *Knot's* principles it cannot be our guide. Yea 4. To follow the Church in an errour, may be damnative though the errour may not be damnative: because another not knowing it to be an error may hold it without damnation: but if I knew it to be an error & yet follow it, I incurre damnation, because I resist a known truth. And 5. Since the universal Church cannot shew its charter of being exempted from all errour, it is not

necessary

necessary for her *dilucies to have such a visible existence as is necessary to afford a guidance.* So then, whereas he askes me, *by what Logique do you inferre, that because the Church is secured from all damnative errour, therefore according to my doctrine she is not secured from other errours;* I answer, it is very true, *simpliciter loquendo*, that the affirmation of one species doth not allwaies include a negation of the other; namely when that which is affirmed is not a constitutive difference thereof. But considering his words *Cum grano salis* and giving him good reason why he should mean them so, I could not be blamed for guessing that he meant them so.

Yea the words which he hath used in this chapter for expressing the priviledge of the Church, are yet so put togeher that they may seem suspiciously to bear such a construction. Neither does he here positively deny, as would become his confidence, this distinction. To put it then to an issue; I shall put them to their choice, how those words shall be understood; whether distinctively, or by way of epithet. If distinctively, then my consequences stand good upon that ground. If not, then have they such a task upon them which all the Roman wit and industry will never throughly performe; for first then must they say that either all errour is damnative (which indeed should have been proved upon former urging as much reason for all sins to be mortal as all errours to be damnative; and more too; since sin hath the guilt of the will, simple errour hath not) or else there may be errours not damnative (which makes for us against the necessity of an infallible judge as to all points) or that the Church cannot erre at all. And then here will be a double labour to prove (and indeed a double errour to say) First, that it hath not erred. 2. that it cannot erre. If the latter, then to be sure the former indeed: but if the former, then not presently the latter. Yea if they will then stand to it, that the Church is secure from all errour whatsoever; then their Church is not the Church. And the consequence is good and strong, for that Church can erre because it hath erred in the Latin Bible;

in the supernumerary Canon of Scripture; in the point of Transubstantiation in Communion under one kind: In their Counsails; as hath been shewed already; and in the point of merit *Ex condigno*, if the 30. Canon of the 6. Sess. of the *Trent* Council be compared with *Rom.* 8. 18. The Canon of the Council speaks an Anathema to him that shall say, that the good works of a justified man do not *vere mereri*, truly merit increase of grace, consecution of eternal life, if they shall die in grace, and also increase of glory. The Canon of the Scripture saith, I account that "the sufferings of this life are not worthy to be compared "with the glory wich shall be revealed: οὐκ ἄξια παθήματα, do "not weigh with. Now whether Scripture be our rule of faith or not, this must be an errour; since they acknowledge the Scripture to be true and infallible. For, whatsoever is contradictory to truth is false, this is contradictory to Scripture which is true. In this they have erred from the Latin Fathers in the sence of the word; from the Greek Fathers in the matter; and from the Scripture, which is our rule, and was the rule of the Church until a Church rose up which would not be ruled. And let them take notice too that *sufferings* are the best part of our obedience: and if they are not worthy, how should good actions merit. More errours of their Church might be named, but one errour with them is enough to contradict infallibility, and to discharge us of following their Church.

He saies then I quarrel with *one of the Cardinal vertues even Prudence her self*. Ans. I think I may quarrel with one of the Cardinal vertues. *Prudence* is one of the Cardinal vertues, in Morality: and one of the Cardinal vertues in Divinity. Prudence is the politique vertue; and so is their Religion a politique Religion. And if a man may proceed prudently in the choice of his Religion, then he doth not beleive first, and then understand; as yet the vulgar Latin reads that text; but we must understand first, and then beleive. Prudence is a Moderatress of actions;

no

now a mistress of Faith. And how doth Prudence consist with implicite Faith, which believes what it doth not know? Prudence is a vertue of reason, which is contradistinguished to Faith. And if we may proceed prudently in the chusing of our Religion, then we may well exercise the judgment of discretion in matters of Faith, and therefore are not simply bound to take upon trust whatsoever their Church obtrudes.

He goes on, *Then you conclude all the force my former Argument hath, it hath from Scripture. Is not my Argument the better for this.* Yes, If the Argument were grounded in Scripture, it were better upon that ground, than upon any other, but this Argument is not good, because it is not taken from Scripture. Scripture is the best Argument in *Thesi*; but in *Hypothesi*, it is not well applied. We like it well that he goes about to prove the Church by Scripture, which is the *highest principle*. But let them not give us such a sense of Scripture which belongs not to their cause, unless against it.

In the next number which he names the fourth (but then it seems the third is lost by the way) he saith I stumble again at the sense of *damnable errors*. Ans. No, For I discourse of it by a Dilemma, or disjunctive, which will take in either sense: but he is not willing to move this stone again, therefore he stumbles at it. N. 4.

Another Text he builds upon St. *Matthew* 18. 17. If he "will not hear the Church let him be to thee as a publican, "or a Heathen. Upon this he frames an argument; God Commandeth us to hear the Church and obey her: *but no kinde of error little or great can be incurred by following Gods command.* Ans. I am glad he hath any such forme of discourse, which would more clearely and handsomely shorten the debate; we therefore answer to it, passing by all disputation about the sense of the Church there, or the quality of the cause. We say then, if he understands the major so as that God absolutely, universally commandeth N. 5.

us to heare and obey the Church then the conclusion were good, and we could not erre in following the Church. But so the minor is denied. God hath not absolutely and universaly commanded us so to heare and obey the Church. If he understands the major specificatively and in things lawfull; then we can grant the minor; but then the conclusion will not be universall, will be peccant, and so not conclude contradictorily to us, who do not dispute here against all obedience to the Church, negatively, as if we would have none; but against all obedience affirmatively, as being not bound in faith to all commands.

And therefore need he not come in with a relieſe, to succour his discourse, by saying from me, *it is impossible to be obliged to assent to an errour though it be not damnable*. This true, but not well applied to me unles he can prove Gods command for absolute obedience in whatsoever the Church proposeth. But as this is true; so it is pertinent for me against him, that though the universal Church cannot erre in points necessary, where errour would be damnative, yet could we not be bound universally to follow upon that account, because no man can be bound to assent to an errour though not damnative.

Neither doth it follow from the Text *therfore meerely and purely for not hearing the Church a man is to be held a publican or a Heathen*, Unles he understands by not *hearing*, not submitting, if he doth not understand it so, it doth not follow: if he does understand it so, this is not to his purpose: because though we may be bound to submit to the Church, yet we may not be bound to believe the Church: these are two things which he should have distinguished. Therefore cannot he prove from hence that the Church cannot erre. He is to be accounted an Heathen or publican upon not submiting to the Church in regard of authority; not upon not assenting, because of infallibility. And therefore though we be all bound simply to

avoid

avoid excommunication; yet if the caſe were put that we muſt aſſent to an errour or elſe be excommunicated: we take the cenſure, and leave the errour; and if they will not have proviſo with a *clave non errante*, for the cenſures of the Church, then what condition was *Pope Honorius* in, who was excommunicated, as before; If God binds againſt errour, and the Church, as we ſuppoſe, bind to it, we can ſay preſently, that the Church cannot abſolve without God, but God can abſolve without the Church. And this anſwereth the next verſe in the Goſpell, as he produceth it.

But the former Anſwer he would take off in the next words by an argument. *To ſwerve from Gods word is to erre. But this Text proveth that the* (the Church) *cannot erre.* Anſ. The major is indeed true: but the Text doth not prove the minor; therefore it is falſe; becauſe he ſaith the text proveth it.

*And indeed if ſhe could, the meerely not hearing her could not deſerve that a man ſhould deſerve to be accounted according to Gods judgment a publi can and heathen.* Anſ. This is denied. Refractorines expoſeth thereunto, without acknowledgment of infallibility. And yet am I ſtill of this opinion, that that Text concernes not matters of faith; but of treſpaſs betwen Brother and Brother, and therefore that Text is not to his purpoſe. This and more he ſaith nothing to here.

But yet I followed him, and ſaid that a man is not bound to believe the cenſure is juſt unles it apeare to be ſo. To this he ſaies, this laſt aſſertion of yours is very *extravagant* doctrine. *For the unanimous opinion of Learned men is, that a man is bound to hold his ſuperiours cenſure or command to be juſt unles the contrary appeares evident.* Anſ, firſt then this determination of the caſe by Learned men ſuppoſeth that a thing may appear evident againſt the ſuperiours cenſure or command. So that by conſequence they have the *unanimous opinion of Learned men* againſt them in two points, firſt that a thing may be evident without the

propoſall

proposal of the Church: for it may be evident against it. 2. Then that the Church may make an injust censure or command. But for his opinion he nameth three Learned men, *Chillingworth*, *Hooker*, *Laud*. So he: as to the first, Mr. *Chillingworth*; he hath nothing for him in his 108 *nu.* For he "maketh use of this rule, [In cases of uncertainty we are "not to leave our superiour, nor cast off his obedience "nor publiquely oppose his decrees[ But how is this applied to our case? Indeed it was his best course not to apply it. Let them then note that this he speakes is *in cases of uncertainty*, namely about things of question: but we are ultimately upon points necessary. And then 2. He speaks against *casting off obedience*: but we are upon assent of judgment. And then 3. The rule he useth speakes that we should not *publiquely oppose his decrees*; but we are upon the negative only, whether he may not suspend his opinion. And hence the Author discourseth, that we may leave them, we may cast them off, and oppose "them, when we are certaine, *as protestants were that what* "*they command God doth countermand*. And for the second, as he nameth him; I think, all things considered, he hath little from him for his use. As the scribe at least mistooke the quotation: so the Author I think mistook the man. In the places quoted [*pag.* 310. 311. *n.* 110.] there is nothing like. It is true that excellent Author had great cause to urge convenent obedience to humane lawes: but he denies intuitive obedience to any law but of God. And therefore if he and Mr. *Chillingworth* be joined in the testimony, that which answered one may answer the other. And further, if they will take *p.* 110. And so on for *n.* 110. They may finde enough to satisfie them of his opinion, that he held Scripture a sufficient rule in matters necessary; and therefore the obedience he urgeth must be in things of order, which is extrinsecall to our debate and not blind neither, as *p.* 110.

The third Authority is rightly quoted but not rightly applied

applied out of that excellent book; for it ſpeaks expreſsly of *externall obedience*: we are upon internall. He ſpeaks for peace: my adverſary ſhould apply it to faith. He ſpeaks it as to private perſons: my adverſary ſhould vltimately apply it to the Church nationall. That which followes is a cavill, that then the private man, *when all comes to all, is the laſt judge, to whoſe ſentence finally all comes to be referred.* Anſ. The private man is no judge authoritative to whoſe ſentence finally all comes to be referred, but exerciſeth for himſelf the judgment of diſcretion; as being to be perſwaded in his own minde as the Apoſtle ſpeaks. And thus much muſt be allowed by my adverſary who lately aſſerted prudence to be of uſe in chuſing Religion. Yea if Prudence be tolerated in things of Faith: Sapience is to be commended, which refers to the higheſt principles; and thoſe are of Scripture. And though it be ſome ingenuous prudence to preferre the judgment of a *General Council* or *the Church*, as to the ſuſpenſion of my opinion againſt them: yet ſurely will it be ſapience to reſt my faith in principles of faith. Therefore this and much more of this diſcourſe comes not home to the queſtion, whether God hath bound me to give abſolute aſſent to the definitions of the Church; and to believe their commands to be juſt, *eo ipſo*, becauſe theirs: Ἴσως ἴδιον ἔπεται.

Neither is it *impoſſible that a General Council ſhould not ſee it.* There is a double impoſſiblity; ſimple and Phyſical: and then Moral. The Simple impoſſiblity would make Faith; bnt ſuch is denied. The Moral, If it were granted could not make ſuch a Faith as they ſtand for, namely an infallible aſſent. But the Moral impoſſibility which is no more than a great difficulty, is not to be yeilded neither, ſince the *Trent* Council. They might as well not ſee that which was *Evident*, as they did ſee that which was not Evident: Communion under both kindes was Evident in Scripture, and the practiſe of the Church: yet notwithſtanding they would ſee what was not Evident,

Comm union

Communion under one kind. And therefore least Communion under both kindes should seem more Evident, *Bellarmin* prudently informes that some of their learned men would not construe the 2. of St. *John* of Sacramental participation.

And the ground he goes upon is sandy, *that which is truly Evident will of it self appear to be so, or at least to the most judicious, upright, and best instructed Prelats of the Church.* Ans. This may appear to them, *de facto* not so. Were not the *Trent* Fathers so? And yet they did not see what was Evident in the point of the Communion, and in some other points too, as some of their own Religion did think, as we have it in the History of the *Trent* Council. 2. What a case should the poor people be in, since *populus non distinguit*, and yet they must compare the most judicious, and most upright, and best instructed Prelats. Thirdly, Take the Fathers of all ages and places; and then their Doctrines will not abide the test, as hath been made good to them by Bishop *Jewel*. And therefore their Doctrines are not *Evident* by their own Principle, because not Evident to them. And then fourthly, somewhat Evident to them the Romans have cashiered, Infant Communion, the Millenary opinion, *trine immersion*, standing up in prayer, therefore they had best betake themselves to *more than humane assistance, namely, from the Holy Ghost*.

His debate afterwards about the consideration of the cause of the Censure, will come to little, if it be considered *that the act of not hearing the Church*, is ambiguous; and may relate either to the non-assent, or to the contempt. The former doth not simply expose him to the Censure in Heaven: the latter may. And if he understood his own terms, he must rather take them of the latter, because he speaks of an *act of not hearing*. For the non-assent is negative to an act; and so is the Greek considerable παρακοὴ this is it which makes him *truely guilty of not hearing the Church*.

That

That which follows in way of conceſſion, is deſtructive of his building; for he grants an errability of the key, in which caſe the Cenſure is not *ratified in Heaven*. So then, how ſhall we know whether any be *truely guilty*. For as the Church cannot be infallible to us at all, to believe it, if not infallible in all, as Mr. *Knot* argues; and my Adverſary too, if he denies the diſtinction of *damnative errours*: ſo it cannot bind infallibly in any, if not in all, though there be a diſtance betwixt Faith and fact, the proportion is the ſame. And yet again, if they will divide here by affirming infallibility in Faith, fallibility in Fact; why do they urge this Text, which reſpects the latter?

And therefore that which follows. *And ſo the Church cannot erre in denouncing excommunication againſt ſuch a perſon*, in dependance upon the premiſes, is as much as to ſay, the Church cannot erre, when the key doth not erre. Yet it might have erred *in ſenſu diviſo*, which is ſufficient for our purpoſe, becauſe our diſpute is upon the point of poſſibility Ἀνάγκη τὸ ὄντα εἶναι ὅταν ᾖ, as *Ariſtotle* ſaid: It is neceſſary that that it be while it be; yet was it not therefore neceſſary to be before it was: for that deſtroys the diſtinction of things contingent from things neceſſary. And therefore what follows hereupon, if I ſhould anſwer he would account neceſſary to be anſwered, when it is not.

At the end of this Section he ſaith, You *highly wrong* St. Athanaſius *to ſay he did not hear the Church*. Anſ. I ſhould be very loath to be truely guilty of this: and ſurely, if he grants that the Church may be miſtaken in the *fact*, he may be miſtaken in this Cenſure; which he ſhould have proceeded in *ſecundum allegata et probata*. I ſaid this, St. *Athanaſius* did differ from the reſt of the Church, when the whole world did groan under Arrianiſme. So he did not hear the Church, as differing in opinion, though it is not ſaid that he did not hear the Church, as diſobeying the Cenſure.

Here he ſuppoſeth that upon the virtue of former Principles he may conclude of the Church, *No, She cannot erre in an errour not damnable.* No? Let that which was formerly granted be compared with this, and we ſhall conclude the contrary. To excommunicate a perſon who is not to be excommunicated, is to erre. The Church may excommunicate a perſon not to be excommunicated; Therefore the minor is as good as confeſſed by him, becauſe the Church may be miſtaken in the *fact*. Nay he ſaith it in terms [*and ſo there may be an errour in the miſtake of the fact.*]

He proceeds, *Hence that common Doctrine of Antiquity, that it is not poſſible to have a juſt cauſe of ſeparating from the Church.* Anſ. Beſides the nullity of this upon the want of a true ground, as before; he doth miſreport the axiom; or elſe he muſt diſtinguiſh of *Separating*. There is no juſt cauſe of Schiſm; for, the propoſition hath in it τὸ μὴ ἀπολογητὸν; becauſe if there be a juſt cauſe, it is not Schiſm, but though every Schiſm is a Separation, every Separation is not Schiſm. Take then ſeparation in ſpecie for Schiſm, ſo it may be true; but a Separation from a Church impoſing errours in Faith, and things unlawful in practice is not without a juſt cauſe; and therefore is it not Schiſm. It is not without a juſt cauſe by his former confeſſion juſt now in thoſe words. *So men ſhould be bound to aſſent unto an errour, which is impoſſible.* And again this is to be underſtood of Separating from the Catholique Church, or from a particular Church for that order wherein it agrees with the Catholique. But this is not our caſe; for the Roman is but a particular Church; and we ſeparated upon Catholique Principles, that ſo we might hold union with the Catholique Church. And then again there is a difference betwixt a national reformation, and a private Separation. And therefore yet the diſtinction is not diſabled, namely of ſeparating from the errours and not from the Church, unleſs it were better proved that the *Church is ſecured from all errour*; which that text doth not prove. Then goes he on

on to take away somewhat I said to the text in my first and fifth answer to it. He claps them together, and would make me to conclude thus, *this maketh nothing for the Authority of the universal Church.* Ans. Let them remember again (for *Aquinas* tells us that we cannot forget natural Principles) that the whole is greater than the part. I allow much to a particular Church in correspondence with the Universal (therefore little to their Church.) And if I do reply that this text belongs also to particular Churches, then this doth redound to the honour of the Universal Church. And that this doth belong to particular Prelats to excommunicate, he himself doth confess in this Section. Therefore must he conclude that I conclude for the Universal Church. And yet moreover, in all this long gloss upon the text, how little have we had of that upon which all in this discourse turns, namely whether Authority of excommunication (be it in the Universal or a particular Church) respects not formally the contempt, not the non-assent. Let them speak less, or more to the purpose.

And yet again he would drive it on in a loose way, that we have a command from God to hear the Church absolutely and universally.

To this purpose he saies, *Those who disobey the judges, disobey the Common-wealth: so generally speaking, those who disobey the Prelats of the particular Church, disobey the universal Church, commanding her to proceed according to her Decrees, Canons, and definitions.* Ans. Here is not much, and for them less: A Common-wealth is a term ambiguous; and may be taken strictly or largely: strictly in the form; largely as including head and members. And in this large sense may be considered with more respect to the Body, or to the Head; in *confuso*, or in *capite*. If he takes it in the strict sence; it is not to any purpose; because there is a different reason of laws in the Common-wealth and in the Church: For in a Common-wealth so, Laws

proceed from them as the efficient thereof: but in the Church, truths and duties do come from God; and therefore in such cases the disobedience reflects upon God. Now the case we dispute upon is in necessary truths and duties. If he understand a Common-wealth largely, and then with more particular repute to the people, the disobedience to the judges doth not reflect upon them, unless objectively and consequently, because though they are not their Judges by way of Authority, yet they are their Judges, in way of End, for their good. If it be taken with more relation to the head, whose judges they are by authoritative commission it is true that the disobedience to the Judge doth redound upon him: but here is difference betwixt them, for particular Prelats do not depend upon the universal Church, as Judges do upon the Head of a Common-wealth; because Bishops have their Authority by divine right, which was contended for hotly in the *Trent* Council, and had proceeded affirmatively had not the Roman Court bandied against it. And then also the matter of disobedience we speak of is from God, not the universal Church: but the matter of Civil disobedience to the Judge is from the Head. And then again we do not speak of disobedience positive (which my Adversary doth instance in) but in obedience, which is negative. And then again particular Prelats are not so bound in things of particular order, as the people are bound to the Laws of a particular Nation. And also then this will redound to the Adversaries prejudice; for the particular Prelats of their Church have not proceeded according to the Canons, Decrees, and definitions of the universal Church, as hath been shewed. And also this is against them, because then my Adversary confesseth that this text under debate is competible fairly to particular Churches; and therefore they have no reason to appropriate it to themselves. And so upon the whole matter we can say as much in a due respect to the Catholique Church, as they

they do here, and yet hold our own. So then he doth not contradict here. And yet again he is importunate to prove that disobedience to the Church at last redounds to Christ and God, out of the 16. of *Sam.* 8. "they have "not rejected thee but me. Ans. Surely they had better have supposed this truth than proved it. First, and again, we are not upon *disobedience* but inobedience: not upon rejecting Authority which God had vested in *Samuel*, but upon suspending assent to a truth proposed. And then 2. In the time of *Samuel* it was a plain θεοκρατία and the people had Laws and Ordinances given them by divine immediate direction: but it is yet to be proved, whether what Churches do enjoyn do come from God immediatly to the Prelats. And therefore since that case had contempt in it, the discourse suits not our question.

*And Christ to his disciples (the first Prelats of the Church) he that despiseth you despiseth me.* Ans. Those Disciples were not in his sense Prelats; for the Apostles were the Prelates, but these whom Christ here spake to, were the seventy two Disciples or Elders. Therefore he mistakes in the quality of the persons. Secondly this was by Christ applied to ministerial acts of preaching; these other Prelats seldome do; yet if they did, here were a mistake in the quality of the matter, which with us is in point of jurisdiction.

The main Text, then is, St. *Matt.* 23. 2. The Scribes and Pharisees sit in *Moses* Chair, all whatsoever therefore they say unto you, to keep and do. He saies here, *Mark these most ample words, all therefore whatsoever.* Ans. we have marked them; and yet cannot this Text be understood reduplicatively & without exception, because the Pharisees did teach errours. He saies then, *many of them publiquely did teach errours though not by publique authority.* Ans, So then they did teach errours, and publiquely. This which is affirmative is enough for us: let them prove the negative for them. But this is strange, that they should teach and teach publiquely, and not by publique authority. If they

they did teach, they did teach upon authority, though not with that authority as Christ. If they did teach publiquely, then they had publique authority. And doth not he seem to profess that authority was vested in them by a lawfull succession of *Moses*? And did my adversary thinke that they could sit in *Mose's* chaire, and yet not have publique authority? But it may be they were not in the chaire, when they did teach errours, no? How then is it said, the Scribes and Pharisees set in *Moses* chair? And how then did they *teach publiquely*? But they were not in the chair of *Moses*, when they did teach errours. Will they say so? But in their sense they were in the chair of *Moses*, because they understand thereby authority: if they doe not, they are taken; for then they must understand it of teaching the doctrine of *Moses*, and then by consequent, *all whatsoever* must be understood as symbolical thereunto. And if they would understand it thus, we would also subscribe this proposition, that when they did teach errours they were not in the chair of *Moses*. As namely when they did teach for doctrines the traditions of men. Alas if this should be applied to the *Pope* in his chair, how should the people be able to distinguish betwixt teaching *errours publiquely* (which my adversary doth acknowledge) and teaching them publiquely with *publique authority*, which he denies? They who formerly have told us that it is so easie a way to find by the Church to Heaven, do now say that which shews it is an hard matter to find the Church teaching by publique authority. One being imperfect in sight asked his servant, whether there was not such a thing in the window: and the Servant asked the Master whether there were such a window: they tell us that there is in the Church infallibility taught by publique authority: and others aske the question where is that Church, and when shall we know when it teacheth so.

He calls them the *lawfull successours of* Moses.

He tells us that they cannot do any thing against Scripture, *when they proceed by way of defining with publique authority*. Yea, but we must have another infallibility to assure us that

that they do now thus define. Let them infallibly define when the Church doth infallibly define, since all good discourse begins with a definition. And then let them tell us by what method we may come to the knowledge of this proposition, that the *Rulers* of the Jews condemned Christ by private authority.

Neither is that to be swallowed, that *the Church to the full hath now as much reason to be heard as the old jewish Church then.* For if he takes *the Church* here for the Church universall, it were more likely indeed what he saies: but how is that possible to make an address to them upon all occasions, unles there were a standing Representative. But if he takes *the Church* here for a particular Church by way of an *Individuum vagum*, or determinately, of the Roman, it were indeed possible to make with more expedition address to such: but then it would be shewed to be likely that any particular Church of any one denomination should have such priviledges annexed to it, as the *old Iewish Church had*; especially if we take in into the account of the *old Iewish Church* those extraordinary revelations of God immediately made to *Moses*, and the Preists and the Prophets, whereof *Malachi* was the last. Indeed such an infallibility only will serve their turn, but till they prove it, μηδαμῶς ἄκυρον ἔστω. *And as the Synagogues authority was not limited so as to be obeyed and heard only in points of trespass betwixt Brother and Brother, but was to be extended to all whatsoever they should order: so you cannot (without depressing the authority of Christs Church who had a better covenant established upon better promises, Hebr. 8. 6.) hinder her power from being extended to all whatsoever she shall order.* Ans. This undoes all. I take the μετάστασις of my adversary for my major proposition: then I assume, what proportion the Synagogue had to the whole *Iewish* Church a particular Church hath to the universal Church: therefore every particular Church is not limited in *authority*, but, as he saith of the Synagogue, that its *authority* was not limited Acts. 3. 17.

limited ſo as to be obeyed and heard, &c. And then what need of an univerſal Church, & Biſhop & Council? Indeed ſuch a power would be requiſite for the Roman Church becauſe they cannot ſtretch it beyond a particular Church. But this ſpoyles all his diſcourſe in his four firſt Chapters which he ſaies he intended as for the univerſal Church. But what uſe of this when a particular may ſooner and more eaſily decide all, having all authority to command and to be obeyed in all things which ſhe ſhall order? Thus not only the five Patriarchates were independent of any one, and had all Iuriſdiction within their own diviſions; but other Churches nationall, might be independent; and independents might be Churches. And ſince ten men with the Jew made a people, and a people made a capacity of a Synagogue, why may not the Church of *England* have an *Authority not limited, &c.* And what need then of running to another Church for more authority?

But neither iſh is Text in the Hebrewe well underſtood or elſe not well aplied in his Anſwer. For the eſtabliſhment *of a better Covenant upon better promiſes* is not certainly intended to have reſpect to the viſible Church for diſcipline: but to the inviſible Church for ſalvation. It reſpects Chriſt as the Great High Prieſt to ſave his Church by the ſacrificing of himſelf once upon the Croſs for us; not as King of his Church by way of an externall policy, as if the Goverment of his Church were part of his Kingdome, and of his Goſpell. If ſo they give the right hand of fellowſhip to the other Diſciplinarian.

But alſo he takes it ill that the text ſhould be limited to caſe of treſpaſs betwixt Brother and Brother; and he thinks rather it ſhould belong to the caſes of *hereſie* which is a treſpaſs *committed by one Brother againſt all his Brothers and their deareſt Mother the Church, yea* St. Thomas *calls Schiſm of which hereſie is alwaies guilty, the higheſt crime againſt the whole Community.* Anſ. It is one thing to ſay what the text intends; another to ſay what it may be by diſcourſe

diſcourſe accommodated to. The direct reſpect of the text in the ordinary ſenſe of the letter, is clearly carried to caſe of treſpaſs betwixt Brother and Brother. And the Pontifician by his principles and uſe, is ingaged to the ſenſe of the letter prinipally. But 2. *dato non conceſſo*, that it ſhould alſo reſpect caſe of Hereſie, notwithſtanding alſo that the terms [let him be to thee a Heathen or a Publican we rather referre to the Jewiſh Church than the Chriſtian] yet cannot he have from hence what he would, namely the Churches infallibility of Cenſure in points of Faith. For though the Church did infallibly know on which ſide the truth did ſtand in every point of Faith, and therefore what was oppoſite thereunto (for ὅτι ἁμαρτὼν ὁ κανὼν ἀυτὸς, as he ſaid) and therefore that ſuch a doctrine was to be condemned as Heretical; yet ſince, though the Church do proceed *ſecundum allegata et probata*, it may be miſtaken in the fact, (as he confeſſeth) it may erre in the Cenſure as to a particular perſon; and how then is ſuch a perſon bound to ſubſcribe to ſuch a Cenſure as juſt? becauſe he cannot be bound to aſſent to that which is falſe, as he alſo lately confeſſed. It is true in civil cauſes though the ſentence be injuſt, I may and muſt pay the amercement, there being no Law againſt the courſe of Law; and ſo alſo in Eccleſiaſtical caſes, he that is injuſtly excommunicated muſt abide the Cenſure; but all the Authority under Heaven can never make a man beleive in his Conſcience that it is a juſt Cenſure, when he knows himſelf not to be guilty of the fact, namely publiſhing of an heretical Doctrine; and therefore all that can be exacted by man in this caſe is paſſive obedience; which the Perſon may yield, though the Conſcience doth not yeild that it is a juſt Cenſure. So that the text is yet preſerved in its integrity againſt binding the Conſcience to believe whatſoever is done by the Church to be right and juſt.

After this, he would winde himſelf off gradually from

ſuppoſing any infallibility of particular Churches, that ſo all at length might be aſcribed to their Church in *ſolidum*; for ἐντὸς παρεμπέμψων κωλύει τὸ ἀμφίτειον, as he ſaid. And the Authority he would have to fall upon the Pope and a Council: yet he expreſſeth one *Head of the Church and the ſupream Prelat of the Church*. So then; Before, when there was a profeſſed occaſion to diſpute the point whether the Pope were Head of the Church, he was ſhie and cautious and uncategorical: now by the by, and under the winde he can aſſert it ſo that he may not be bound to prove it. We ſee then what reaſon they have to afford Prudence a good place in Religion, *Nullum numen ab eſt ſi ſit prudentiarum*.

And the main exerciſe of Eccleſiaſtical authority, the key is laid upon his ſhoulder, *He is bound to uſe the fullneſs of his power to ſuppreſs the ariſing hereſie*.

Now ſurely they are bound ingenuouſly to ſpeak out whether they mean this *fulneſs of his Authority*, of all the Authority he hath, or of all Authority that the Church hath. There is a fulneſs of the Fountain, there is a fulneſs of the Veſſel. Do they allow him the fulneſs of the Veſſel? So indeed the *Trent* Council ſeemed rather in a good part thereof to incline, when they urged ſo much to have the title of the Council to be eſtabliſhed *The Repreſentative of the whole Church*: for had this proceeded, his power had been ſunk in their power. But if he be the *Head* of the Church, my Adverſary muſt allow him the fulneſs of the Fountain; then the controverſie is determined betwixt the Jeſuits, and the Sorboniſts; and the latter are caſt in the ſuit. But then, what need of a Council towards infallibility, when he hath all the Authority in himſelf, as being the πρῶτον δικαϊκόν? And then my Adverſary hath not pleaſed the Court and the Jeſuite in joyning the Council as partners in the Authority. Nor do the words enſuing bear good reſpect to the Pope, as Head of the Church, namely, *that he may forbid (if he*

*feareth*

*feareth danger in the Doctrine*) *that no ſuch Doctrine may be publiſhed until the Church ſhall think it fit.* Are not theſe diminuent terms of the Head (indeed almoſt comminuent, if we may ſay ſo) as if the Head of the univerſal Church, the ordinary Paſtour, and Vicar of Chriſt, Succeſſor of St. *Peter*, could not preſently ſee that there was danger in heretical Doctrine, or could not ſee whether it were heretical doctrine *until the Church ſhall think it fit.* I had thought the Pope had been an Independent; and ſhould not have depended upon the Church for a final reſolution at a point heretical. And if the Church muſt meet in a Council to conſider of it, and all Popes be as diſaffected to a Council, as ſome were to the *Trent* Council, what ſhall become of the people in this danger of hereſie? I had thought a Council had been but the vicar of Chriſt His Counſail, and though he did condiſcend ſo far to make uſe of their Counſail, yet he could do all alone by his own Authority. We heard before that particular Prelats had Authority not limited: and muſt my Adverſaries Supreme Prelat be bound to wait for a General Council?

*And then all muſt be as St.* Paul *ſaith*, Heb. 13. 17. *Obey their Prelats*; So he, Anſ. This he means of Prelats not in *confuſo*, but in *conventu.* And to theſe infallibility ſhould be annexed. So then, Thoſe Prelats who are here meant are infallible. Particular Prelats are here meant: therefore they are infallible; and ſo there will be no need either of a *Supreme Prelat*, or of a Council. And that particular Prelats are here meant, we need not prove to the Pontificians who take too much notice that there Epiſtles were written but upon particular occaſions, and for particular times. And therefore this being written to the Hebrews ſhould not by that account concern us Yea if it were written with an intention for Prelats in a Council, it muſt be written for them *per ſaltum*, not for the preſent times; but for above 300. years after. 2. This relates to thoſe who did watch for their Souls, which be-

being put *per ſe* is to be underſtood of thoſe that teach the Word; and ſo it correſponds to the 7. *ver.* where thoſe that are ſet over them are ſpecified by teaching the Word. The obedience then there injoyned reſpects thoſe as teaching the the Word, not formally as exerciſing authority of Jurisdiction. And therefore that Text is not here well applied.

*Thus far the power of the Supreme Prelat is extended by the conſent of the whole Church.* Anſ. We ſee then their own differences to be ſuch as that they may be aſhamed to upbraid us with our differences, and we not aſhamed to be upbraided. Can my Adverſaries exactly point out the *maximum quod ſic* of the power of the Supreme Prelat of the univerſal Church? Muſt he that is by them acknowledged to be the Pillar of the Church have his Pillars ſet him, beyond which he muſt not budge? Tell it not to the Canoniſts, and the Courtiers of *Rome.* As *Cyril* of Jeruſalem notes that the Sea where it ſtints in the flote makes in a ſimilitude a Line, which God hath ſet it that it ſhould not paſs: So have my Adverſaries ſet a Line to the Roman Sea; hitherto it may go, *by the conſent of the whole Church.* So then the members may appoint the Head what operations and how far it ſhall perform, and the Head ſhall not be onely influxive upon them, but they rather upon it. This opinion will make Popes thie of Councils, if he hath his power extended by their conſent. For they do not mean the *conſent of the whole Church* to be of the confuſaneous multitude; do they? if they do, then the Church in this ſenſe ſhall be the firſt ſubject of Eccleſiaſtical power. Yea, If they alſo mean it of the Church in a Council, how is the Pope ſucceſſor of St. *Peter*, when the Pope muſt be limited by the Church; St. *Peter.* as they ſay, was Prince of the Apoſtles immediately from Chriſt. And ſurely according to this reckning *Bellarmins* diſtinction will come to naught, who ſaies the power of Kings is not by divine right, but by the conſent

ſent of the people: but the Popes power is, for it comes not from the Church, but Chriſt, as in his 3. *b. de verb. Dei cap.* 9. And then he is not the Rock and foundation of the Church; but the Church of him, and ſo the ſpiritual Monarchy muſt be ſlighted. How far is this from that Italian who preſented a book to *Paulus* the fifth with this inſcription, PaULo Vto. Vice Deo, out of which one picked the number of the beaſt, *666.*

But therefore my Adverſary goes at the Spaniſh rate, very ſuſpenſively, *in omnem eventum*; as being diſpoſed to a pauſe betwixt the affirmative and the negative; and he ſaith, *Now though the Supreme Head of the Church be as infallible as* St. Peter was, and ſo on in a long ſpeech. Well, but doth this affirm? or is it a meer ſuppoſition, which doth *ponere nihil*? He hath carried the Pope up to the clouds, and there he ſtaies: but let them come out of the clouds, and tell us plainly, whether we muſt take a cloud for *Iuno*. Such irreſolution doth not become infallibility. He ſeems to make him as infallible as St. *Peter*, becauſe he ſhould be Supreme Head of the Church; (and yet St. *Peter* was not Supreme Head of the Church, if the reſt of the Apoſtles be included in the term [Church] as members) and yet he muſt not be as infallible as St. *Peter*; becauſe caſes of difficulty muſt be referred to the Council. It follows, *yet if he ſeeth this newly vented doctrine fit to be declared hereſie, if it be ſo; or to be imbraced, if it be fitting, and propoſed to all Chriſtendome; then is the true time of calling a General Council, and not to let the people contend by allegations of Scripture.* We are now ſtep by ſtep ſoberly mounted to the Soveraign Authority of the Church in a Repreſentative. Anſ. 1. What needs all this trouble if he be as infallible as St. *Peter*? and why do they ſay that St. *Paul* went to St. *Peter* to confirm his Doctrine by St. *Peters* Authority, ſhould there not have been a Council called then as well? According to them St. *Peters* infallibility confirmed St. *Pauls* Doctrine: the Pope according

according to them is Succeſſour of St. *Peter* in his infallibility to all effects and purpoſes as Ruler of the Church, therefore he may do it, and *fruſtra fit per plures* alſo. 2. Note we here that it is to be the true time of calling a Council upon debate of a point heretical, which reſpects Articles of Faith: but we have been often told by our Adverſaries that we are to have an infallible Judge to decide all controverſies emergent. Now if there be not a Council to be called but for deciſion of Articles of Faith; as to their's we have leſſe need, ſince he that is an Heretique is αὐτοκατάκριτος as the Apoſtle ſpeaks. And therefore he needed not to foreclude the peoples contending in allegations of Scriptures; for ſurely Scripture may be alleaged without contention, and if it happens, *ſapiens non curat de accidentalibus*. And ſo alſo the Council may contend in allegation of Scripture; and therefore they ſhould not alleage Scripture. Yea alſo we may ſoberly contend that in articles of Faith there needs not be any other contention, ſince they are more plainly delivered in Scripture, than that we muſt ſtay for a General Council to be eſtabliſhed in the belief of them. Bleſſed be God, we are better provided for in articles of Faith, than to ſtand in ſuch neceſſity of a General Council; which when ſuch will be, and how we ſhall know it is ſuch (according to them) we muſt know by another General Council, and that by another, and ſo in *infinitum*: ſince we know nothing infallibly but by the infallible authority of the Church; and that in a General Council. We will then take that for our Law, whereby the Council muſt Judge, ſince the matters are plain which are great: and about other things ſmall, the Judges will not meet. *Lex non curat de minimis*. "Let *Hiero* conclude for himſelf, from hence for-"ward whatſoever *Archimedes* ſaith, it muſt be believed.

But it ſeems it is a book caſe: and example we have hereof by the practice of the Apoſtles in the 15. of the Acts; *Though the Apoſtles were all infallible in their doctrine, yet they could*

*could not determin that grave queſtion without calling a Council.* Anſ. firſt, if thoſe termes [could not] attend an abſolute negation of power, they are denied. For they that were infallible in their doctrine could have ſeverally determined that controverſie, as we take power abſolutely, as well as St. *Peter* confirmed St. *Pauls* doctrine, according to them. But he ſeemes to mean it in a qualified ſenſe after the manner of *Aquinas* diſtinction of neceſſity: therefore thus he, *for this is neceſſary for the better conviction of heretickes; fuller ſatiſfaction of the weaker ſort, and further comfort of the whole Church.* This end of calling a Council upon ſuch a neceſſity, I ſuppoſe he reflects to the Council of the Apoſtles; as if the ſenſe ſhould be they *could not* conveniently and upon the ſuppoſition of ſuch ends, *determine that grave queſtion without calling a Council*: but then we are not under an abſolute neceſſity of a Council. And untill this be proved, my adverſaries have done nothing: for a neceſſity of convenience of a Council will not ſerve their purpoſe becauſe we can grant it. But 2. we ſay this example is not for his turn; becauſe this Council was called upon a queſtion about things in their nature not neceſſary: but we are upon the debate of the abſolute neceſſity of councils in and for things neceſſary, not things of ſcandall only, and yet again; 3. As it is commonly noted they in their Councils cannot conclude their determinations as in that Council of the Apoſtles (*it hath ſeemed good to the Holy Ghoſt and to us*) becauſe thoſe Apoſtles were infallible in their diſcourſe as well a in their concluſions; but thoſe who are now members of Councils, are confeſſed by *ſtapleton* to be fallible in their diſcourſe and how then ſhall we be ſure that they are infallible in the concluſion, unles they can prove that though the diſcourſe be not rationall, the concluſion will yet be propheticall. And yet 4. The Apoſtles themſelves proceeded to the determination of this queſtion by principles of Scripture: therefore Scripture is the higheſt principle to raiſe faith even in things

of

of controverſie. And this concludes againſt them who make the Church in buſineſſes of faith to be the higheſt principle. And therefore alſo whatſoever binds the Chriſtian faith hath its obligation by vertue of Scripture. So then nothing he ſaies doth ſufficiently render that ſenſe or uſe he makes of that Text, *Dic eccleſiæ*. And yet he hath not then found (though he does Thraſonically ſay ſo) *a Judge in matters of faith, a living Judge, an infallible Judge excluding all poſſibility of errour*. We can help them to finde Judges *dicendo pluraliter*: but ſuch a Judge as he ſpeaks of here, he hath no more hope to find then need to ſeek. And yet ſuch a Judge he muſt have for the juſtification of Chriſt's law in the former Text, *otherwiſe Chriſt could not poſſibly have declared it to be ſo haynous a crime not t ohear the Church being that it might have been no crime at all: he obliged all to obey and hear her, therefore ſhe cannot lead us into an errour*. Anſ. I think we ſhould not have had ſo many words about ſuch aſſent if they had not more need thereof then the Text, or Chriſt of their defence; they have more neceſſity of Chriſts juſtification then he of theirs. His words above have two formes, one in an hypotheticall way, the other in way of an Enthymem; I deny the conſequence in both; and to them both I ſuppoſe one propoſition, and that is this, Chriſts command to obey doth not inferre impoſſibility of errour in the Church. Simply it is therefore falſe what he would have to be conſequentiall. To hear the Church therefore hath two things in it; one act which is internall, and that is to give aſſent to what the Church ſhall order; the other an externall act of ſubmiſſion, the former may be denied, and therefore ſhe may erre, the latter may be due and therefore not to be denied.

And conſequently his *infallibility of knowledge of this point is not ſo great as of thoſe points which are delivered by Scripture*, namely not underſtanding it *de facto*; becauſe his knowledge of points delivered by Scripture is, *de induſtria*, ſmall; but *de poſſe*, his knowledge of points of faith delivered by Scripture

Scripture may be greater then his knowledg of this, because it is not delivered by Scripture.

So that for his Creed, I say as the Frenchmen proverbially are wont, *il ne point damne qui ne le sait*, he is not damned that doth not believe it: there is difference betwixt standing *up* to what is proposed, and standing *out against* the *Church*, in contempt. Absolute belief will then be rational, when moral assurance, which yet is not alwaies to be had, makes Faith.

And when he hath proved the assumption, that the church of *Rome* is *only* this Church, *and by manifest consequence*: then the Pope shall be no usurper; and yet not *infallible* neither. We deny the Postulate with a contradiction because we can deny the Church's definition without a contradiction.

Then in the seventh and eight numbers he useth plain evasions. In the seventh he tells me that he doth not use that method which I tell him he should have used, in some favor to me, when I come *to use this very method*, *I do foresee that it will so galde you*, and he saies, I would have the *burthen* shifted off to the *other shoulder to avoide present trouble*. Ans. these are his Rhodomontadoes. Is not the method a *priori* more rationall? If he can prove the Church infallible, and absolute authority to belong to it, our obedience must follow; but since obedience is *ambiguous* and distinguishable, though obedience in some respect be due yet not on that part which inferres Infallibility; but on that part, which respects authority, as we take authority for power. 2. There was nothing said by him formerly which I have not fully answered; and now the reinforcements, but it became him to say so, who was more pinched. And how will he quits himself in this method we are to see in the 12. *numb*. And in the eight *numb*. here he tells me the reason why he sales nothing to St. *Austins* authority produced by me, namely lest he should *lose his labour*, but I know a better reason because he will find too much *labour* to answer it.

And as quick diſpatch the ninth Paragr. deſerves. For he doth not offer any anſwer to any reaſon in mine, but here ſnaps in order to a vindication of the Text *Matt.* 20. 7. for his cauſe. He took exceptions at our tranſlation *ſhould keep knowledge*, he renders it *ſhall keep*. I defended the tranſlation by the poſſibility of that ſenſe in the Hebrew becauſe it hath no formal ſubjunctive: By the ſcope of the Text, becauſe they are blamed for their default. He perſiſts againſt our tranſlation, *becauſe all originals* (he means all copies; or indeed all tranſlations he ſhould mean, becauſe of what follows) *ſpeak clearly in the future as the Hebrew doth: and alſo the Greek and the Latin, which two want not the Subjunctive Mood.* Anſ. But firſt he ſuppoſeth that which is in queſtion that the Hebrew is to be underſtood as in the future. Secondly other tranſlations with him are fallible, ſave only the Latin; therefore the other conclude not. Thirdly the tranſlations may be underſtood in compliance with the Hebrew, which is frequent alſo in the New Teſtament, with the Greek: and therefore if the Hebrew may be ſo conſtrued, ſo may the others by an Hebraiſm. Therefore if our Engliſh tranſlation were faulty herein, yet muſt it be otherwiſe convinced of a fault in this: Eſpecially ſince Fourthly, We give good reaſon why it ſhould thus be conſtrued, namely by the Scope; *Intelligentia dicti ſumitur ex ſcopo loquendi.* And therefore may we well with *Junius* and *Tremellius* hold our Engliſh, which in general, whatſoever he ſaies of it from ſome of our own, hath not ſo many faults in it, as *Iſidor Clarius* found in their Latin, 8000.

I asked him, is this Text meant of the Prieſts of *Rome*. He ſaies, *I told you it was not.* But why then ſhould the other Text about the Scribes and Phariſees by proportion prove their infallibility? and not this, ſince we have here the Prieſt in a ſingularity, if not *ſignanter*? Well then by his own conſent, this Text is not ſufficient for him: for it concerns private Prieſts; and they are as fallible as *tranſla-*

*tions.*

tions. Onely the private Priests may know the sense of the Church better, then the sense of Scripture by the translations, as he speaks in more words to no more purpose. Ans. First when we have the sense of the Church, are we sure that that sense is true? though it be the true sense of the Church, is the sense of the Church true? this is yet in question. There is no question but the sense of Scripture is true, whether the sense of the Church is true is τὸ ζητούμενον. Secondly, Let the plain places of Scripture in things necessary be compared with the difficulties in the Interpretation of the Trental Definitions; and then let them judge whether we had not better stand to Translations, which are made by a Nation or approved, or else to the opinion of private Priests, for though *her Doctrine be so carefully published amongst all intelligent men*: yet this is to be understood materially in the words, not formally in the sense. And so the Scripture is published amongst all intelligent men, in the former way, And if the people be not intelligent men too, how shall they know whether the true sense of the Doctrine of the Church be communicated to them by learned men?

But the *Priests of the old Law* were to direct the people, which were not *to be directed by their own reading the Scriptures*. And the *Priests of the new Law doubtless exceed those of the old Law*. This in the substance of it we have had before, and have taken away the grounds thereof. And besides it is false that the people were not to be directed by their own reading the Scriptures. What saith St. *Luke* of the *Bereans*? If they examined by the Scriptures what Doctrine St. *Paul* taught, were not they to be directed by their own readings of the Scripture. And why did the Jews apply their children to the Law from five years of age? And why did St. *Paul* take notice of *Timothy* to be trained up in the Scriptures from his childhood? and why is the man said to be blessed, who amongst other things, meditates in the Law day and night? Is this to be under-

ſtood onely of the Prieſts. 2. Therefore though they went to the Prieſts in doubtful caſes; yet not for ordinary knowledg in things neceſſary; therefore this is not compared *ad idem* to our caſe. Thirdly, the Prieſts were bound to direct the people by the Law, were they not? To the Law and to the Teſtimonies. And not by Tradition. So are the Prieſts of the new Law, (as he calls them) to direct the people by the Scripture, not by Tradition, or determinations of the Church, unleſs according to Scripture.

Therefore his *queſtion* of the caſe *in a matter of doubt*, which he compares his proceeding in with the old way of the Jews, *Numb. 6.* comes not home to our buſineſs, and therefore we may ſend it home again; and yet not for fear of not being able to anſwer what he is not willing to urge, that when in the upſhot, the queſtion ſhould be drawn up to the High Prieſt, *he who would not hear him was deſervedly put to death, Deut.* 17. He leaves this for us to take down our ſelves; he will not apply it, and herein he does diſcreetly fearing it may be, leaſt it ſhould be ſaid that that which he would ſeem to have referred to the High Prieſt for final judgment, ſhould indeed be referred to the Judge contradiſtinctly ſpoken of; and by the Syriack diſjunctively to the Prieſts and Levits. And 2. I hope the High Prieſt at *Rome* doth not undertake a ſentence in cauſes of blood. And thirdly in that caſe there was contempt, *thou ſhalt take away the evil*, it is not ſaid errour, and *analogum per ſe poſitum ſtat pro famoſiori analogato*, and alſo *ver.* 12. this is intimated, *that man that will do preſumptuouſly*. Fourthly, Suppoſe it had been referred to the High Prieſt for ſentence final; this might be extraordinary in a Typical reſpect to Chriſt. And they know the rule, *Extraordinaria non trahuntur in regulam*: We cannot make a rule of extraordinaries. And yet alſo was not the High Prieſt, *quatenus talis*, Infallible; as appears in the condemnation of Chriſt, as I told them.

Now

Now he would diſtinguiſh by ſaying, *The Jewiſh Church erred not. The true High Prieſt (without whom there is no true repreſentative Church) erred not*: Caiaphas *was not the true High Prieſt, the other true High Prieſt was Chriſt.* Prety ſport. So the Roman Church never erreth, becauſe Chriſt is the true Head: but then the Pope ſhould not be true High Prieſt, nor true Head: for ſo *Caiaphas* and he muſt be compared, in relation to Chriſt. May we not almoſt think that our Adverſary is within a little put to his ſhifts? For Chriſt was in being, I hope, and had declared himſelf the *true Meſſias*, and yet he ſaid, "the Scribes and Phariſees ſit in *Moſes* chair; then we are bound to do all whatſoever is ſaid to us, without a true High Prieſt. 2. How many Popes were not true Popes, and ſo not true High Prieſts: and then when ſhall we be certain whether we have a true High Prieſt, and conſequently a true Church, and conſequently that it cannot erre? For as abſolute infallibility hath it ſelf to particular Faith in any point, according to Mr. *Knot*: So abſolute certainty of a true Pope hath it ſelf to our knowledg whether it cannot erre. Well, but he hath told us that he is the true *Pope* whom the Church ſhall accept: So before, but then *Caiaphas* was the true High Prieſt, becauſe he was accepted by the Jews. 2. Without a true *Pope* the Church might erre; and ſo erre in the choice of a true *Pope*: and then we are never a whit the nearer. And then, Thirdly, Chriſt was not the true High Prieſt, becauſe he was not accepted by the Jews, but condemned. And then again, as well the Council might be infallible without a true High Prieſt, as a General Council, ſince without any Pope or Head thereof: but the four General Councils they will ſay are infallible: and yet we ſay there was no Pope then in their ſenſe. Therefore the *Council of Arimnium*, which he ſpeaks of here was not fallible upon that account, namely, becauſe it was not confirm ed by the Pope; for the other Councils were not confirmed by a Pope neither;

there

there being then none. And if the Council of *Ariminum* did themſelves chuſe a Pope, then he was accepted by them; and ſo he was the true Pope, as before.

He ſaies then, *This true High Prieſt* (namely Chriſt) *erred not: the true Head of the Church not erring, the Church cannot be ſaid to erre.* —*iterum Criſpinus.* This is μετάβασις εἰς ἄλλο γένος. Was Chriſt an external Head in the policy of the Church? If ſo, my Adverſary and the Diſciplinarians might joyn Principles for their Government. And upon this account the Pope ſhould not be ſtiled onely the Vicar of Chriſt, and Succeſſor of St. *Peter*, but alſo the Succeſſor of Chriſt, the Sea being void by Chriſts promotion. 2. If Chriſt be the true Head of the Church, then the Pope is the falſe Head; unleſs the Pope and Chriſt be all one; or let them diſtinguiſh that Chriſt *is* a true Head in one ſenſe, namely the vital and ſpiritual Head, the Pope onely the Miniſterial Head; and if they thus diſtinguiſh, then though the vital Head doth not erre, the Miniſterial Head may erre. Thirdly, Chriſt as the true Head of his Church hath relation to the Church inviſible: but we have now to do with the Church as viſible, and upon this conſideration the promiſes which are made in Chriſt and by Chriſt to the Church as St. *Math.* 16. and elſewhere, ſhould not be made to the Church virtual, or to the Church Repreſentative, but inviſible unto which properly he hath relation, as Head. And thus we acknowledg the promiſes made to the Church againſt errour, are true; namely againſt errour damnative. Fourthly, If they cloſely intend this which is ſaid in ſervice to the Roman Church ſo farre, that it cannot erre, becauſe Chriſt is the Head; then what? Chriſt doth the Pope muſt do, and what the Pope doth Chriſt muſt do: but ſurely Chriſt did whip the buyers and ſellers out of the Temple, ſo doth not the Pope do: and Chriſt inſtituted his Supper in both kinds, ſo doth not the Pope: and then if what the Pope does, the ſame, Chriſt ſhould be ſaid to do;

do, Chriſt ſhould contradict himſelf; for by himſelf he inſtituted it in both kindes, by the Pope in one, and alſo Chriſt in Pope *Liberius* did ſubſcribe againſt his own divinity. Laſtly there might have been another true Head Miniſterial in the Church without prejudice to the former; might there not? If not, farewell Pope and Monarchy; If ſo, then his anſwer is none, that Chriſt was then *the true Head of the Church*: for ſo neither *Caiaphas* nor any other ſhould have been High Prieſt.

That of St. *Athanaſius* was touched even now, and it is good ſtill, if Councils be infallible; ſince the reaſon, why that of *Ariminum* ſhould not be good, is not good; and therefore that might be as infallible with eight hundred Biſhops, as the Council of *Nice* with fewer; ſince alſo according to my Adverſary, Chriſt is the true Head of his Church, and therefore no matter whether there was any Miniſterial Head or not, to confirm it.

And as for exceptions againſt our Engliſh Tranſlation again from ſome of our own, we need ſay no more; for we did not hold the Tranſlation infallible. As he ſaid of a Chriſtian that he is *mundus & mundandus*, cleare and yet to be cleanſed; ſo may it be ſaid of the Tranſlation; it was good and yet might be mended; and hath ſince, ſince their exceptions. But 2. If they will argue from imperfection in one place to a corruption in the whole, it is a fallacy, *a dicto ſecundum quid*: but ſimply it will redound, if they might ſo argue, to the undoing of the infallibility of the Latin, and purity too. And then if he takes aim againſt our Engliſh by the Interpretation of that of *Malachi*, or the Tranſlation rather, they beſpeak a falſity in the charge, for there was good reaſon by the connexion for that Reddition.

Here we have little but a rhapſody of repetitions of former grounds, which being ſhowed to be rotten, he can ſolidly build nothing.

His firſt and principal ground here is that the Church cannot

cannot erre; and this yet is the main queſtion: And therefore his compare betwixt the Prieſts declaring the Law of the Church, and our Miniſters declaring the Law of Scriptures by the Originals is not well grounded. Firſt, Becauſe that ground is not made good. Secondly, becauſe we do not urge infallibility by the Miniſters, as they muſt. And thirdly, becauſe though their Prieſts ſhould infallibly conveigh the Doctrine of the Church; yet the Doctrine of the Church may be fallible: ſo is not Scripture in the Original. And what he ſaith concerning *moſt corrupted Tranſlations* hath been formerly anſwered in compare with their Latin; which they pretend infallible and is not, and therefore their Church is not infallible: but we pretend not tranſlations infallible, though better then, theirs is now. *That we are not aſſured of true Scripture* and if ſo, *yet not of the true ſenſe*, hath been anſwered; as to things neceſſary: and more aſſured then they by their Church. *That many neceſſary controverſies are not contained in Scripture*, hath been refelled and returned to them with uſe. We have ſhewed that they have no reaſon to *take away from the people the uſe of Scripture*. *That Chaos of Corruptions* in our *Engliſh* is more eaſily denied then proved; and the recrimination to Latin is more eaſiely proved then denied

And as for the taking of the law from the mouth of the Prieſt to be as ſecure, as to take the *Signification of a word in Scripture from the publique conſent of all men*, they may know, if they have no more for faith, they have no faith Divine; as the effect cannot exceed the cauſe, ſo the aſſent cannot exceed the ground thereof. *Aqua tantum aſcendit quantum deſcendit*.

Their permiſſion of Scripture is in that language which the people doth not underſtand, and this is not then to permit them Scripture, which is, as he ſaies, *knowen to moſt and bred men in Learning*.

And he hath no reaſon ſurely to ſpeak of *vulgar Tranſlations*

*tion*; for surely theirs is the *vulgar Latin*; though Christned by the *Trent* Council, and never a whit the better for that.

And I hope his *Decall Prælats* will not allow the use of Translations but to them whom they are *secure* of not to change their Religion, which is as much much as to blinde them, and then to give them leave to see. *Further use of Scripture* is not an *abuse*, unles the Antient Fathers exhorted the people in the reading of Scriptures to an abuse; and he was much mistaken in the saying that we *see the sad effects of it*, it is a fallacy of accident.

Our Ministers are as *rightly ordained and canonically licensed to Preach*, as their Priests to say Masse; and more too, unless they could prove that office better. And yet a simple contradiction is also better than a simple negative:

*Upon our word* the people may *rely* as well as their people upon the Priests, and somewhat more upon the former considerations of an impossibility of Faith in the truth of their being Priests. And yet our Ministers are not masters of their Faith, but helpers of their joy; as the Apostle sates of himself also, the people do not simply rely upon them, but believe by them.

And then he comes to the occasion of this debate betwixt us, namely because that Noble Person carped *at our blind obeying our Priests, and believing them, whereas* all of our Religion *could go to the fountain*. Ans. Whether the words of that Noble Person were such as he expresseth them I cannot say, but taking the Translation to be so far Scripture, as that it agrees with the Original, so far are they the Fountain, not in language, but in sense. And so they go to the Fountain oppositely to the Doctrine of the Church, though not as oppositly to Translations. And as for that which was said by that Noble Person, of *blind obeying*, is not here denied; and we know that this blind obedience is commended by the Jesuite for the right

and Christian obedience. And their implicit Faith must be blind obedience upon two accounts, First because they ought not to examin whether what the Priests say to them doth agree with the Doctrine of the Church; and secondly, they cannot examine it.

But he excepts against that Fountain, *but alas! when that fountain which they conceive themselves to drink to their eternal health, is so poysoned, as I shewed in my last Ch. that millions of millions (as your own* Broughton *saith) run to hell flames by occasion of this corruption.* Good words. He could not certainly say so unless he hath it from a Pope and Council. And doth he take a passionate *Hugh* to be as credible with him as Cardinal *Hugh*. And I think also the main thing for which *Hugh Broughton* was offended with our Translations, was about the descent into Hell; which by the *Trent* Council should seem not to be so necessary: for they make no mention of it in their Creed. And also if the sentence proceeds sufficiently upon *Hughs* words, then their Latin is poysoned more, as it should seem more by *Isidor Clarius*, one of theirs. And my Adversary might have remembred that we might as well slight *Hugh Broughton* in a singularity; as he did *Isidor Clarius*. And it seems, the danger by Translations is not so great, because he saies, *I may most truly say that far more perish by misunderstanding (whilst they follow their Ministers and their own private judgement of discretion) that which is truly Translated, then perish by the corruption of that which is falsely Translated.* Ans. This comes loosely from him also. If it were obscure, the Translation might miss, if not, how could they be in danger of perishing? If they follow their Ministers or their own judgement without weighing the Scriptures, they may erre as the Romanist does by blind obedience: But if they compare the Doctrine of the Ministers with that of Scripture by their judgment of discretion, as the *Bereans* did that which was spoken by *St Paul* (and as he would have them compare the Doctrine of our Ministers

Ministers with the Authority of their Church by their judgment of discretion) they are in no such peril of damnation. That which is not known without great difficulty, may be unknown without great danger. Otherwise we make God, they may think, an hard Master.

*Thus they perish for not hearing that Church which their own Scripture bids them hear, whereas in doing that which God bids, there can be no danger of errour great or small* Ans. My Adversary is very importunate, without new Arguments. If he means that the Scripture bids us hear the Church universally, as to Faith, he begs the question. If to hear, as in point of trespass, or so as not to contemn, he fights with his own shadow, as being ignorant of the Elench. And so of the other clause, if he means it so that God bids us absolutely do as the Church bids us, there is the same fault in the discourse. Better may we return it to them. They perish because they will not hear the Scripture, which the Scripture and the ancient Church bids them hear, whereas in following Scripture *there can be no danger of errour great or small*: and since also the Church can have no credible Authority but from the Scripture: (neither hath he proved the contrary whatsoever he saies) and therefore he does well now to tell us that the Scripture bids us hear the Church.

He saies, *the doctrine of the Church is Gods Law.* Ans. This is a kind of cryptical proposition. I am sure Gods Law should be the doctrine of the Church; but he means it for his use, whatsoever the Church teacheth is Gods Law. What? is *Gods Law in recto*. He speaks as boldly, as if being but yet a private man he could not speak under infallibility. So then we need not look any further for Gods Law, and the Scripture then will not onely be insufficient for our direction to heaven, as they say; but not necessary, which sometimes they will grant. It will not be necessary neither as a rule, as *Bellarmin* sometimes; nor as a commonitory. And we may wonder,

why amongst their Counsails they did not reckon this for one, namely to use Scripture, since upon this account we are not bound to it under peril of damnation; but onely they will not allow it such perfection, as to Counsails. But then if the Church bids us not to read Scripture, or bids us not to read Scripture, it is not Gods Law, and it is Gods Law, but it is Gods Law that we should look into Scripture. To the Law and to the Testimony. Search the Scriptures saith Christ. If the Church teacheth that we must worship Images or buy Images, it must be Gods Law against Gods Law of the second Commandement. If the Church bids us communicate under one kind, it must be Christs Law against Christs Law. And so God must contradict himself: and Scripture must follow the sense of the Church; as one of them is said to have said, what a cause have they which hath need of so desperate propositions?

*And private Priests are farr more likely to teach them Gods Law, by teaching them what the universal Church holds to be Gods Law, than by teaching them what they themselves conceive to be Gods Law, as you would have them do.* Anſ. This doth not contradict. If they say it is more likely, we can say it. But what is this to Fakir? And upon this condition they are undone. For which of their private Priests are able to say positively that this is the doctrine of the whole Church for all ages and places since the Apostles? The Church otherwise considered hath no considerable Authority: and so we mean the *universal Church*. Secondly, Although thus the Church is not the *regula regulans*, but the *regula regulata*; yet they cannot bring the consent of the universal Church for the points of difference.

*Ad num.* 11. 12. 13. 14. Herein he gives me many words towards asserting Tradition to be a sufficient bottom of faith; but in all these how little he takes away of my answer, any one may say better then I.

In the beginning of the eleventh, he goes upon a false supposition

ſuppoſition, that in the times before *Moſes* the traditions were received by the Church *upon the infallibility of the Church*. They were received by the Church, not infallibly by the Church. The Church had it ſelf herein as a mean of propoſall, not as the laſt motive of faith. Their faith was terminated by the ſpirit of God in the matter of tradition; was not determined by the Church's Authoritative delivery: the *objectum quod* of their faith was not the Churches propoſal. Then 2. ſuppoſing what we do not grant, yet there is not now the ſame reaſon for the Church: becauſe they had more appearances then of God to aid in the Church, then now there is or hath been ſince the Apoſtles times. And therefore the rule is good, *Diſtingue tempora*. 3. This will make a circle. How were they aſſured infallibly of tradition by the Church? How were they infallibly aſſured of the Church by tradition? then the reſolution of their faith was not into the credit of the Church as infallible. Therefore doth my Antagoniſt in vain ſay to me, *ſhew the ground they had there to hold the Church infallible*. Nay the proofe hereof muſt come from the affirmer: *Aſſerenti is eſt probare*. They are to make good here two things firſt, that they did hold their Church infallible; otherwiſe how could any of the people hold it to be infallible, unles the Church did ſo determin of it ſelfe? and then that though they did hold it to be infallible, yet that it was ſo and muſt be ſo, otherwiſe they could not believe anything.

Afterwards he makes a reſtriction of my diſtinction, *that the word in ſubſtance of it was before the Church, which was begotten by it*: and then he tells me what I adde thereunto, *that when there is as much need, and as great a certainty of tradition as formerly*, then he may urge the argument. Here he ſhifts and ſhuffles. He tells me that I muſt underſtand it of the *unwritten word* and to be only *in orall tradition*. Right I underſtand it ſo. But what is this to the queſtion; whether the manner of conveyance by the Church in way of orall tradition was infallible; and then whether we

are

are bound to take all or part of neceſſary doctrine from the Church this way. And can they now conclude the Church infallible in the matter of tradition beſide the word written, by their tradition of the word unwritten? And can they ſhew that the *Iews* were equally bound to any Tradition before the word written, which was not agreable to the word afterwards written? Otherwiſe how can they ſupply this to their purpoſe in urging Traditions differing from Scripture in matter equally to Scripture; as the *Trent* Council defines, as before? Let them come to the point; and ſatisfie demands.

In his diſcourſe following I can grant him all untill he come to this, *they only had Gods word revealed by tradition.* This we muſt debate upon as being ambiguouſly delivered: for [only] may relate to the ſubject [they] and ſo the ſenſe is, the *Iewes* only had Gods word revealed by Tradition, but this is concerned here; or [only] may have relation to [Gods word] as to the matter which was revealed, and ſo the ſenſe is, that they had only that word which was revealed by tradition; and this comes not to the point neither, or *only* may relate to the manner of revealing by tradition, and thus indeed it is proper for the debate, but thus it is denied; if we take it thus, that the word of God was no otherwiſe aſſured to them than by tradition, though they onely being Jews had onely that word of God which was revealed by tradition, to believe; yet had they not only tradition, by which they did beleeve. And therefore his concluſion muſt be naught; and all he ſaies to that purpoſe, even to the end of his Paragraph.

In the twelfth he deales about the need of tradition, and he ſaies *that the need or neceſſity of Tradition which you conceive to have been greater then than now, doth not make the Traditions more Credible.* Anſ. True it is, that ſimply the need of them doth not make them to be more credible, if they be to be believed: but there is the queſtion whether there is now

an

any to be believed necessarily, in point of faith, when there is not such need of them. Scripture is as credible when we are heaven, in regard of it self; yet there we have no need of it: but as since we have no need of it there, we have reason to believe that there it will not take place; so neither should Traditions, when there is not that need of them. My answer then did bear it self upon this, that if there were that necessity of Trad ition now as then, he might urge the argument, because God have would provided sufficiently for security of tradition now as then: *falsum prim.* And we may take his own similitude, those that have read *many credible books of France*, have they any need of *orall Tradition*, to believe that there is such a Kingdome as France? he saies no: yet these last are as certain, he saies. Well then, no more need have we of tradition for the doctrine of Christ which we sufficiently read in Scripture. So then, although he concludes Traditions hopefull (and *superflua non nocent*) yet can he not conclude them as necessary; which should have been demonstrated.

But this he would doe in following words, *even now when we have Scriptures and Traditions, we have ever had with them a perpetual succession of horrible Divisions opening still wider and wider.* Again odd reflexions upon Scripture: but it is well he joynes Traditions with it to take part of the consequence, as he thinks: and yet it may be he does not think so; but that the cause of the *Divisions* is only Scripture: and had we had no Scriptures, we should have had fewer Divisions. Doth he think so? Then how is Scripture necessary, as they generally confesse, when it had been convenient that there had been no Scripture, upon this consideration? And how should they prove the Authority of the Church without Scripture? Well, but take his words in their ordinary sense, and what kinde of argument will this be. *Even now when we have Scripture and Traditions*; therefore now Traditions are now as necessary or more

more then when there was no Scripture? Nay they will seem to be less necessary, when notwithstanding them, we have more divisions. How then shall these divisions be remedied? It may be by more traditions. What? New traditions? *oppositum in apposito.*

But in the next words he speaks out *All* (divisions) *commonly caused by misinterpretation of the Scriptures, to which inconvenience they were not subject, before all Scripture was written. And therefore in this respect there is now after the writing of the Scriptures, a greater necessity then ever of Traditions.* Ans. So then, he hath now commented upon the former words, and his sense is plain that had we not had Scripture we should have had less need of Traditions. First, we had thought the Learned men of their Church had devised Traditions, not because we had Scripture, but because Scripture was wanting in the matter of necessary doctrine. And so he himself telles us presently after, that since *part of the Canon is lost*, we must say there is use of Traditions. And yet now we have more need of Traditions, because Scripture is written. But, it may be, he will say there is more need of Traditions to clear the interpretations of Scripture. Yea, but then he should mean by *Traditions* Traditive interpretations of Scripture, as they are called. But are not these lost too? For who is there can give us any account of them? And as for other Traditions we are never a whit the better he hath told us before; since notwithstanding we have them, we have a *perpetuall succession of horrible divisions opening still wider & wider.* Let them remember that of *Nilus*, to accuse Scripture is to accuse God. 2. Are the divisions necessary in points necessary? If he means so, it is flatly denied. If in other points, it is not to the question principal. 3. *A quatenus ad omne valet consequentia*: if we be bound to Tradition, as such; we are bound to all; and yet all Traditions they have not kept. 4. Traditions doe not lessen divisions about interpretation of Scripture: for one division is whether Traditions

ditions have any ground in Scripture. And he may know that he hath named Texts to this purpose, and because there are differences about Traditions, therefore, by his argument, we should not be ruled by them; as indeed they do not order themselves by them. They keep Tradition in the controversie for the use of the Church; not in practice, as he said, *Antiquitatem semper crepant, novi indies vivunt*: and we must let goe the Scripture in controversie and practice for the use of Tradition and the Church, they and their Fathers have troubled the waters of Scripture for the cheif Fither. Let them let their Traditions alone: and they will see their discourse is *a non causa.*

Then he repeats importunately the uses of Traditions, but not my refutation. And he speaks of Traditions of such matter as we have in Scripture: which is beside the mark, we are about Traditions in their sense of that matter which is not in Scripture equally to be believed to Scripture, which should prove the insufficiency of Scripture, and the necessity of them. This is τὸ περιττόμενον. And therefore much he saies to this purpose is like the drift of snow, which makes an heap, but will not bear one up from sinking in it, Yet I must note his wit in that he saies, that *God must purposely by a miracle have infringed the course of nature, if the former Traditions of the Church should grow then to lose their sufficiency in order to the same effect, when they were strengthened by so great an Authority as that of the sacred writers was.* How little in this is there of a sober soul; As if the matter of Tradition was written by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost to confirm the authority of delivering it by orall Tradition. Doth it not appear in *Eccles. History* that the matter of the New Testament, was written that it might be more certain and firm in the minds of men? It seems then that the looser way by Tradition was not so sure and standing——*litera scripta manet.* Secondly, If there be so *great an Authority of the sacred*

*writers*, ſurely we may make more uſe of what they wrote to confirm Traditions. *Adeone pudorem cum pudicitia perdiderant*; as he ſaid, that the Authority of the ſacred writers ſhould be imployed as it were onely to ſerve Tradition. Thirdly, The Authority of the ſacred Writers did rather confirm the truth of them than the uſe, for why were they written, if Traditions were neceſſary after they were written, as ſuch? Therefore fourthly, He concludes but ſufficiency of them in order to the effect: but this is not effectual to his purpoſe. If he did conclude neceſſity of them after the writing, this would be ſomewhat: but then there would be more in the concluſion than is in the premiſes, and yet ſurely all were nothing to the ſtate of the queſtion; becauſe we make no queſtion of ſuch Traditions. Again he pleadeth loſſe of the *Canon*, upon which he thinks, Tradition ſhould *revive*. Anſ. That we have ſpoken of ſufficiently before; that the ſuppoſal doth not inferre inſufficiency of the Canon, and therefore doth not inferre neceſſity of Traditional matter beſide what is written. And alſo, is there yet (notwithſtanding the loſſe of ſome part of Scripture) enough remaining to confirm Traditions? yes, they will ſay. Then God it ſeems hath taken more care for Traditions than Salvation: there is enough for Traditions yet in Scripture; not for Salvation. Well but again, there is enough in Scripture to confirm all Traditions, is there not? If there be, then there is enough for Salvation, or elſe there was not enough in Traditions: Becauſe they will ſay Scripture hath confirmed all Traditions; to the Jew namely. And then, if there was enough to the Jew for Salvation in the Old Teſtament, which was adæquate to Tradition; then much more have we enough for Salvation by the New Teſtament: and therefore is there no need of any Tradition beſide the Canon.

Then he returns to an enarration of the uſe of Traditions even after writing; which is of no uſe to them, but to us; becauſe

becauſe here he produceth ſeveral Texts for Traditions in the ſame notion; as 2. *Theſ.* 2. *Gal.* 1. 8. *Tim.* 2. 2, 2. and herein he prevaricates in his own cauſe: For if theſe Texts be meant of ſuch Traditions which were afterwards written in the matter of them, they are ſo underſtood as we would have them to be underſtood; and they are not pertinent to the queſtion about Traditions beſide Scripture, in the matter of them. Secondly, Whereas he ſpeaks that theſe Texts confirm the *certainty* of Traditions; we grant it; namely of thoſe Traditions which were afterwards written: but how do theſe Texts confirm the certain neceſſity of thoſe that are not written And therefore thirdly, He is mightily diſappointed if he conceives thoſe Texts ſhould bind us to ſtand upon Traditions *now more than ever*; for the formality of Tradition was there ſunk in the writing; and the matter of Tradition was the ſame with that which was writtten, in his own confeſſion, unleſs he drives the Texts Heterogeneouſly to his own words.

And he impingeth upon the ſame ſtone again, *what wiſe man would put out one light, coſting him nothing, becauſe it will be ſhining of its own nature (unleſs you will needs have it hidden) becauſe he hath now another light; but ſo, that even with both theſe lights many of his houſhold will ſtill remain in darkneſs.* Anſ. He ſuppoſeth a light added to a light. It is well then that Scripture is aſſured to be one light, but his Tradition ſhould be compared to a light when there is no other light, namely when the Scripture is defective. Secondly, If he thinks Tradition is a light *coſting us nothing*, he may be deceived; for it will coſt a great deal of Scrutiny, ſince we cannot ſee it *ſhining of its own nature* infallibly. And thirdly, If ſome be ſtill *in darkneſs with both theſe lights*, then ſurely they may be more in darkneſs with but one, and that is Tradition; therefore they ſhould allow the people the light of the Scripture, ſince both too little, as he ſaies, to ſome. But fourthly, What

if one light put out the other in the true ſtate of the queſtion; namely Scripture Tradition ſuperadded in matter? And what wiſe man will light a ſtraw candle, in the *Fathers* expreſſion, when the Sun ſhines? the Sun-light of Scripture puts out the ſtraw-light of Traditions, condemning thoſe who teach for Doctrines Traditions of men; "which the Romaniſt does in ſome proportion. And fifthly, what wiſe man would have ſuch a light which ſerves his turn beſt when it ſhines leaſt: for Traditions, if we believe our Adverſaries, are a covered diſh, dainties, to be kept private for thoſe who are fit to receive them; the more wiſe and perfect men which may teach them to others. The myſtery of Salvation, that is made common by writing: but the myſtery of Tradition is put under a buſhel. The myſtery of the Trinity is delivered in Scripture; but the myſtery of the *Trent* Traditions muſt not be familiarly known. So then, ſay they what they will or can, we ſhall ſooner find an extinguiſher for the light of the ruſh candle, than they for the light of the Sun.

*But if you ſay that if Scripture had not been given us, we ſhould have had a more certain Tradition given us.* So he delivers my words; which were not ſo, but thus, "If Scrip-"ture had not been left to us, we ſhould have had Tradi-"tion more certainly conveighed to us, as the Goſpel was "before it was written. Now ſome difference there is betwixt *given us*, and *left us*; for that which is *left* to us is intended for our conſtant uſe, which that which is *given* doth not connotate. So ſome Pontificians will ſay, the Scripture was given upon particular occaſion: but was not left to the Church as a fixed univerſal rule. But there is yet more betwixt us about my words, we ſhould have had Tradition more certainly conveighed to us; ſo I ſaid: he reports me thus, *we ſhould have had a more certain Tradition given unto us*. A more certain Tradition given, and a Tradition more certainly conveighed, are not altogether the ſame, the former ſuppoſeth the matter of Tradition

as

as not certain; and this we can deny as to those times when there was no Scripture, as written; the other speaks *de modo tradendi*, which comes closer to our question. For we can perswade our selves that God who is graciously provident for his Church, wherein he hath placed his Name, would have taken care that if there had not been a certain direction in writing, the matter of necessary Doctrine and practice should have been more certainly communicated to us.

So then he thrives very little by compare of the Christian Church with the Jewish, although the Christian Church be more *noble*. For first the compare must be of the Jewish with the whole Christian Church, because the Jewish Church (Proselyts being included therein, namely Proselyts of the Covenant, as they were distinguished) was all the Church there was. And secondly, Because no part of the whole Church can compare with the Jewish Church as to priviledges: and then by this reckoning how little of Nobility will fall to their share? Thirdly, As the Tradition (which was it whereby the matter of Scripture was proposed) was for the time necessary before the matter of Scripture was written: so also must the Tradition of the Christian Church be considered as in relation to the time before which the matter of the New Testament was written, therefore he should have pleaded, if he would have it done patly, that there was any Tradition of Faith after the Old Law was written, beside what was written, which was to be believed unto Salvation equally to what was written; and then have drawn down a parallel Line of proportion of the same (though he would have more nobility) for the Christian Church. Thirdly, If the nobleness of a Church be antecedent to more certain Tradition, as he thinks, then how happened it that there was so little a time betwixt the preaching of the Gospel and the writing of it? It seems then, if God provides for Churches according to the nobleness of them,

that

that the better provision for the Church is by Scripture, The Christian then hath a more certain way of Faith than by Tradition.

And as for means of securing Tradition in the Christian Church, which he compares with the Jewish in, he hath no cause to bragg. For first, they cannot say or prove that they have all Traditions in number formal and material. Secondly, They do not practice all. How many are there which St. *Basil* speaks of in his *Tract. de Sp. Sanct.* which they observe not. Thirdly, The safety of them is in the whole Church; and yet forsooth every one must not know them. Fourthly, If so, then have they reason to blush that they have been more careful to keep Tradition than Scripture, and particularly of the Hebrew Copy of St. *Matthew*, and is this for their credit? Fifthly. Are the Scriptures preserved uncorrupt or not? If not, how have they been faithful, as before. If so, then why do their learned men obtrude the Authentiquencss of their Latin upon this account, that when this Edition was made, the Scriptures were pure and uncorrupted, but corrupted since?

*Again the Tradition of Christ's Primitive Church before the Scripture was written and sufficiently promulged, was to be believed upon her sole Authority.* Ans. If he takes that Tradition inclusively to the Apostles who preached that which they did write afterwards, and take Tradition for the matter of what was written, we grant it; if but he takes *tradition of the primitive Church* to be that which was derived to after times, and was not written, we deny it to be believed upon her sole Authority. In the former sense it is true, but not pertinent; in the latter, pertinent, but not true. And indeed this was the notion of Traditions for the first times, namely to be that summe of doctrine which did comprehend the materialls of faith, not to be any thing different from Scripture, or diverse (παρὰ in the first of the *Gal.* 8. doth not signifie *contra* but *præter*) from Scripture.

Scripture. So he will finde *Irenæus* to mean it. And so St. *Cyrill* of Jerusalem in his 5. *Cat.* 117. *p*, of the *gr. last Ed.* makes it to be upon account no other than διὰ τοῦ πᾶσαν ἐκ τῶν θείων γραφῶν περὶ ἑκάστου τῶν ἐγκειμένων σύστασιν, the System out of the Holy Scriptures about every of those things conteined. And again, οὐ γὰρ ὡς ἔδοξεν ἀνθρώποις συνετέθη τὰ τῆς πίστεως, ἀλλ' ἐκ πάσης γραφῆς τὰ κεφάλαια συλλεχθέντα μίαν ἀποπληροῖ τῆς πίστεως διδασκαλίαν, for things of faith were not composed as it pleased men, but the most pertinent things being gathered out of all "Scripture do make up the doctrine of faith. And again as "the seed of mustard in a little grain doth contein many "branches: so faith it self in few words doth comprehend "the knowledge of piety that is in the old and new "Testament. And what followes but that text which he (my adversary named) βλέπετε ἀδελφοί, see therefore Brethren and hold the Traditions. So then if he takes *Tradition* in the first sense, the Church was infallible therein, by the Apostles: if in the second, the Tradition was infallibly Scripture: and the Church believed it upon that account. And that Traditions did not bind either in their own virtue, or without Scripture, they may see in St. *Basil*, who yet speaks much for them. So in the seventh *ch.* of the Holy Ghost, where speaking of the controversie whethre they were to say of the Son of God *with whome or by whome*, he hath these words, Ἀλλ' ὅτι τοῦτο ἡμῖν ἐξαρκεῖ ὅτι τῶν Πατέρων ἡ παράδοσις, &c. this is not sufficient to us that it is a Tradition of the Fathers: for even they did follow the will of Scripture, having taken principles out of testimonies, which a little before we proposed to you out of Scripture. *God therefore said* by his Apostles that the Traditions then were infallible, (being in matter the same with what they wrote) for their *Authority. Now if God said this, shall we upon his fallible discourse* (for even Councils are fallible in their discourse) *come to say the Church's Traditions* are further infallible then agreeable to his word, *though God* never said so, *and*

*ne-*

*never yet expreſſed* any ſuch infallibility of the Church? And thus I return him his own words *mutatis mutandis*: And ſo my Argument out of *Irenæus* is not yet refuted.

Neither doth he take away my uſe of *Irenæus* teſtimony in the next paragr. For as to my Argument what he ſaies is not appliable. It was thus out of his Authority, *If the Scripture had not been left to us*, "we ſhould have had Tra-"dition more certainly conveighed to us as the Goſpel was "before it was written; but the Scripture is now left to us; "therefore no need of certain conveighance of tradition to us.

This Syllogiſm he makes no offer of anſwer to: for that which he ſaies in a Parentheſis, (*though you cannot invent the means, by which Tradition ſhould have been conveighed more certainly, ſuppoſing there had been no Scripture*) I can receive without prejudice to my Argument: for whatſoever Hypothetically ſhould have been done, had not there been Scripture; yet now, ſince we have Scripture, we have no ſuch need of; we now diſpute upon the fact, not againſt the ſuppoſition. Therefore from the dint of the ratiocination he digreſſeth to an obſervation of diſreſpect in me to St. *Irenæus*, becauſe I ſaid, "Neither *can* "*we believe that thoſe barbarous Nations did rely onely upon* "*Tradition*. Anſ. He is in this deceived. To aſſent to Tradition in the matter of it, and not to aſſent to the matter upon the ſole Authority of Tradition, are not ſuch oppoſites as he imagines; for they may well agree. Therefore though the Father ſaid, they did aſſent to Tradition as to the matter; yet not by Tradition, as the manner. Tradition was the *objectum materiale*, not the *objectum formale* of their Faith. And the next words as he alſo perhibits the Fathers words, do defend my anſwer, "*having Sal-*"*vation written in their hearts by the Holy Ghoſt*. So then they were aſſured of the Doctrine of Salvation by the Holy Ghoſt: then they did not believe that Tradition upon the ſole Authority of the Church. So this contradicts my Adverſary, and makes for me; not onely by conſequence becauſe

becauſe it is againſt him; but directly: for then we can as well be aſſured of Scripture by the Holy Ghoſt; & have no ſuch need then of the authority of the Church, as to ſalvation, though the church were infallible, which is one of the things to be proved, and cannot. And yet beſides, this tradition in the ſenſe of the Father, was in the matter of it, Scripture; and therefore hath no conſanguinity with the true ſtate of the queſtion. So then we may conclude in the negative, they did not *rely upon*, or believe *upon the ſole account of that very tradition*, & yet, if they had, it would not conclude againſt our cauſe, becauſe that tradition is not the ſame with what belongs to the queſtion.

To be civil to an Adverſary in this number, all the ſenſe of it may be reſolved into this diſcourſe, *If the tradition of the Church teſtifying her own infallibility in propoſing for Gods word, that which ſhe delivereth for Gods word*, be to be believed, then ſhe is to be believed as propoſing that to be Gods Word, *which is not written*. Anſ. This hath been abundantly agitated before, with our indemnity to the Plaintiffe: but ſince he repeats, I do not. And we anſwer, Firſt, the conſequence is not clear, eſpecially if we extend it to that which is not grounded in Scripture, if he underſtands it of that which is grounded in Scripture, it is not proper to the queſtion. As to that which is not grounded in Scripture, we may ſtill deny the major. Tradition (univerſal) of the Church may be worthy of aſſent as to the truth of Scripture to be the *word of God*, and not ſo of that which is delivered beſide Scripture: which alſo is held by others againſt them, and the reaſon is not yet diſproved; becauſe there was more neceſſity of the Faith of Scripture than that which is delivered beſide Scripture, and therefore may we well ſuppoſe a greater aſſiſtance to the propoſing of Scripture than any thing diverſe. *Deus non deficit in neceſſariis*. Why do they aſſert infallible aſſiſtance to General Councils, not to private Doctors, or to a National Council? Namely, becauſe others N. 14.

are to be directed by the General Councils; well then the Church universal might be more assisted for the proposing of Scripture than for any thing else. But then I deny the minor, the *Tradition of the Church testifying her own infallibility is not worthy of an infallible assent*: It may be worthy of the highest degree of moral assurance, yet not of an infallible assent. No Authority can write, as to Conscience, what a king writes as to civil credit, *reste me ipso*, but that which is immediatly divine. And why then do the Pontificians prove the Authority of the Church by Scripture. The Church without Scripture is not yet Christned, if we take Scripture for the substance of the matter, it will be but the highest form of Heathens. And therefore the Scripture is to be believed antecedently to the Church. And how little his examples have proved the minor, we have seen: even as much as he had cause to conclude against me out of my own words thus, *Tradition in matters of Faith unwritten is of equal Authority to Scripture. The Traditions we stand upon be matters of Faith truly once delivered by our Saviour or his Apostles, though the Revelation were not written by them, therefore this is of equal Authority to Scripture even according to your own words*. Surely it is easier to answer this than to forbear the Person. The proposition was not my words, I hope, categorically spoken, but as being the state of the question; if those Traditions be in the matter beside Scripture. And now he takes this to be my affirmation simply. And then we deny his minor too, because that which they stand upon is not matter of Faith, as being not revealed by our *Saviour or his Apostles*, or *truly delivered* by either; for they are uncertain by which. And if they will urge that Text St. *John* the 16. 22. as *Bellarmin* does, they may think that *many things* might be written afterwards, or were not points of Faith. And this Text heretick's have urged: and therefore by my

Adversaries

Adversaries Logique, he should not. And did *St. Austin* think that any could soberly say that the points of difference were of that number? Or did any of the Saints in Heaven see what they were, *in speculo Trinitatis*, and did send down word thereof?

As for his defence of the exception which he took against the Scriptures being a sufficient rule to us, because *neither the Apostles nor their Successours took any care to have the Scripture communicated to all Nations in such Languages as all or the greater part of them could understand*; my answer is yet good, the care was taken, in that the new Testament was written in Greek, which was a common language then. And this I gave an Argument of, in that the Grecian is contradistinguished to the Jew in the New Testament. And therefore the Greek must be the greatest and most famous part; and therefore the language common: this proof he is not pleased to meddle with at all. Another proof that that was the common Language was that of *Tully* for *Archias* the Poet, *Græca per totum orbem leguntur*. This he takes notice of. And he saies, *and so is Virgil in Latin*. But this doth not contradict me; yea, he gives me a corroboration of my Argument: for whom did *Virgil* imitate? *Theocritus* in his *Eglogues*, *Hesiod* in his *Georgicks*, *Homer* in his *Æneids*. Yea *Horace* had read the Greeks, it seems by his *Gretisms*. Yea *Terence* was so conversant in *Menander* that he was called *Menander dimidiatus*. N. 15.

But he saies, This is to be understood thus, that the *most learned sort of men every where read Greek and Virgil*. Ans. This (supposed) is not exclusive to the Greeks, being the common Language; as to others; since he will think the Latin was common to the people then, and yet the most learned read *Virgil*. And did not all those Nations whom St. *Paul* wrote his Epistles to, understand Greek? Did he write onely to the

*most learned?* In what Language was the Epiſtle to the Romans, and the Epiſtle to the Hebrews (for the Roman Church confeſſeth that this Epiſtle alſo was written by St. *Paul*) written? were they not both written in Greek? yea the Jews that uſed the Septuagint Tranſlation, were many. So *Philo* the Jew; and *Marcus Antonius*, the Roman, wrote in Greek. And therefore that which was ſpoken by the Orator was ſpoken without any ſuch Hyperbole.

He ſaies yet further, either this muſt be ſpoken in *way of a notable amplification, or Scripture muſt be denied*, becauſe even between the two Cities of *Antioch* and *Conſtantinople*, *the Greek tongue was not the vulgar Language of* Pontus, Cappadocia, Aſia *minor*, Phrygia, Pamphilia; *all which Nations the Scripture* (Act. 2.) *teſtifieth to have had different Languages.* Anſ. Though the Scripture ſpeaks of them as diſtinguiſhed in ſpeech, yet not in Language, but dialect; and ſo it is expreſſed *ver.* 6. 8. And ſo γλῶσσα may be reſtrained as to thoſe who had ſeveral dialects: therefore whereas he ſaies *the Greek tongue was not the vulgar* Language of *Pontus* &c. If he means that the common Dialect of the Greek was not uſed by them all, this is not much to be ſtood upon, becauſe it is not reaſonable to ſay that thoſe who ſpake ſeveral Dialects did not underſtand the common Greek; for take them all, *Attique*, *Jonique*, *Dorique*, *Æolique*, and *Exotique*, they differ ordinarily but in terminations or pronunciation from the common.

*within that compaſs is alſo* Galatia *which St.* Jerom *teſtifieth to have had a language ſomwhat like thoſe of* Trevers. An. It is as farre from *Thebes* to *Athens* as from *Athens* to *Thebes* is it not? Then that of *Trevers* muſt be as neer that of greek as that of the *Galatians* which was greek, in St. *Pauls* time. If afterwards the language altered or was corrupted, this doth not contradict us becauſe we muſt

must distinguish times. And therefore yet it remains good, that the *greek was understood of the greater part of the world*; and therefore the Apostles took care to have the knowledge of the Gospel to be commonly understood. And if they had not, God did miraculously by the gift of the Holy Ghost, *sub forma visibili* in the second of the *Acts*, in the gift of tongues. And this concludes against their *Latin service*: as also St. *Paul* discourseth and concludeth against it in the first *Ep. Cor.* 14. And though we cannot tell the time, *when the Scripture can first be shewed to have been thus communicated to the people of severall languages*, what is this to the purpose? If it had not been done afterwards, it is enough to us that the Apostles did write in the most common language for those times. And if it had not been done, it should have been done. But that it was done, appears seasonably in the great Bible. Neither can they tell us, or will, when the vulgar Latin began first to be Authentique; whether under *Sixtus Quintus*, or *Clement* the eighth.

In the beginning he tells me that I moved a question *how the people should clearly know the true Tradition from the false*. Ans. I did move this question: but somwhat else was annexed, which he laies nothing to. Well to this he now answers, first, *they could know this better then know true Scripture from false, for they could not do that but by knowing first the true Tradition, recommending the true Scripture, from the false tradition recommending the false*. Ans. First this hath been often denied him that the ultimate resolution of faith in the true Scripture: is not Tradition: this may lead us to the gate of the Temple, but this does not open the doore of faith. 2. That Tradition which makes an inducement is of the universall, not Roman Church. 3. How shall we know true tradition but by the true Church? How shall we know the true Church but by Scripture; therefore

therefore we must know the true tradition from the false by the Scripture; which contradicts his method.

And he saies, *they (could do this as well* (or better) *than their fore-Fathers for many hundred of years, yea for two thousand, yea for twice two thousand years together.* Answ. First they see then their error in defining Faith so strictly to be an infallible assent: since they here stand upon a comparative certainty (if so) which amounts not to the consistence of faith. Secondly. He supposeth that which is not to be supposed, that their fore-fathers were determined in their faith of the word of God by Tradition. Even now, or a litle before, he said Tradition was estalished to the Jew by Scripture: Now Tradition is that which must discerne and consequently stablish Scripture. 3. It appears that as Scripture is more perfect then Tradition; because otherwise God had gone the worst way, namely from that which is more perfect to that which is less perfect, namely from Tradition to the writing of his word, but that which is less pefect cannot establish that which is more perfect. Therfore neither then, nor now could Scripture receive the blessing of establishment from that which is inferiour 4. In thet imes of the law there was no other Church to vie with the Jewes about Traditions: And therefore they might be more certain of true Traditions: But now there are several national Churches, which may pretend superiority of tradition, or tradition of superiority as the Roman doth: and therefore it is not so sure a way to fixe our last foot upon Tradition. 5. Universal Tradition of all times and places (which only weighs in this cause) is not in other things for them, nor in that canon supernumerary of theirs; and therefore let them either retract the argument, or take it. Yet he will be confident of two Traditions, whereof the efficacie is commended *with perpetuall profession and answerable practice dayly occurring*

*ring*, Baptiſm of Infants, *and praier for the faithfull departed.* The firſt of theſe wo have abundantly examined before: and he does here moſt inſiſt upon the latter, aſſigning alſo his reaſon of more practice of this laſt. *Becauſe they baptize Infants but once, but they pray often for the ſame man who is dead.* And then being more practiſed, it is more confirmed; which *Creſſie* alſo urgeth. Anſ. As for Pædobaptiſm here, he doth not prove it to be a Tradition, unleſs this be a true propoſition, that whatſoever is commended with *perpetual profeſſion and anſwerable practice daly accurring*, is only delivered by Tradition. Tradition is ſuch: but all that is ſuch, is not Tradition. Therefore that propoſition denied. And for what he ſaies towards both before, that the Apoſtles did only by *unwritten Tradition* clearly and undeniably teach the baptizing of Children, *and praier for the faithfull departed*: it is not clear that it is undeniable; and therefore clearely and undeniably it is denied. Baptiſm of Infants hath not yet loſt ſufficient ground in Scripture to keep it from a neceſſity of being named Tradition, as he ſhould have ſhewed. And as to the other, *praier for the dead*, we anſwer, firſt, it ſeemes then it is but a Tradition, and they will pradon us if we ſpeak thus diminutively of it. And whether this will pleaſe all the Roman Doctors, that it ſhould have no footing in Scripture, let it be none of our care 2. For the object of perſons whom they praied for, queſtion would be made, what morally, they were, who were to be praied for; but this he tells us; he ſaies they were the *faithfull*. Well, but all the faithfull, I ſuppoſe. It may be they will ſay, yes. If not; let them give us a reaſon of their diſtinction, according to Tradition. If ſo, then praier for the dead doth not inferr purgatory, which they intend in the praier for the dead. And the reaſon of the conſequence is proved, becauſe praier was made for all the faithfull; and ſome of them went up

to

to Heaven *per ſaltum*, as they will alſo confeſs, namely Apoſtles and Martyrs; and yet theſe were alſo prayed for in order to a joyful reſurrection. And indeed the antient praiers for the dead did reſpect their bodies in the grave to be raiſed up at the reſurrection, not their ſoules to be raiſed out of Purgatory after a plenary ſatisfaction. And what meanes St. *Auſtin* in Tract. *In Iohannem* 49. *unus quiſq; cum cauſa ſua dormiet, & cum cauſâ ſuâ reſurget.* And ſome of their own have lately in this differed from them. Neither had the Roman Church with their infallibility perſwaded the Greek Church hereof, in *Nilus's* time, who hath a learned diſcourſe againſt it. And thirdly, as for *Inſcriptions* upon the *Graves* (whereby he would make a preſcription for the tradition) we ſay two things. Firſt that we muſt have them to be ſhewed to be ſo antient as to have been univerſally uſed in the Primitive times, and then ſecondly, that they were uſed upon the Roman account. And as for *Aerius*, who (onely) as he ſaies denied *praying for the dead*, to be *accounted for this his opinion an Heretick by St.* Auſtin *and St.* Epiphanius, they muſt ſomewhat excuſe us: for this abſolutely is not right for their turn, if true. Firſt not right for their uſe, becauſe he might deny prayers and oblations for the dead in the former reſpect, namely for a joyful reſurrection; and this comes not up to the ſtate of the point wherein we differ, namely whether prayer for the dead was a tradition in their ſenſe, as inferring Purgatory. But 2. Neither is it abſolutely true that *Aerius* was accounted an Heretique for this opinion, excluſively to other opinions of his, as my Adverſaries words import. However he meant them, I will pinch it, Either he means for this opinion only, or for this opinion with other opinions. If for this opinion concurrently with others, this derogates from the common ſenſe of his words and from his uſe too: becauſe if he was accounted an heretique for ſeverall opinions, it may be ſome of them were

were not heretical opinions; and then it cannot be ſaid that he was for every of them accounted an heretick; unleſs we could make ſome to be hereſies, which are not hereſies; and this would be a contradiction. Well then, I take him to mean that *Aerius* was accounted an heretick for this his opinion excluſively to other opinions in a negative preciſion; and then I ſay it is not true. And to bring it to the teſt, one of his Authors ſhall be mine, St. *Auſtin* in his Catalogue of hereſies *N.* 53. He tells us of *Philaſter* that he had made an enumeration of hereſies; and after him, more perfectly *Epiphanius*: and he came after them, and he gives us an account of the Arrians from *Aerius*: and ſeveral things he does ſay of him, that he was ſorry that he was not a Biſhop; and that having fallen in *Arrianorum hereſin* (into the hereſie of the Arrians) he added alſo ſome proper opinions, ſaying that we "ought not to pray or offer oblations for the dead; and that ſet faſts were not ſolemnly to be obſerved; and alſo that a Presbyter ought not to be by any difference diſtinguiſhed from a Biſhop. And ſome ſaid of him that they were alſo *Eneratites*, and *Apotactites*. So then, the reſult hereof is this; if he could not ſay *Aerius* was accounted an heretick, onely, for this. Nay St. *Auſtin* doth contradiſtinguiſh here hereſie to proper opinions. So he might be an heretick and not for proper opinions, becauſe he had fallen into the hereſie of the Arrians; yea and ſome account him an heretick for not diſtinguiſhing betwixt a Biſhop and a Presbyter; therefore though his proper opinions were in the judgement of St. *Auſtin*, heretical, yet can it not be ſaid that he was accounted an heretick onely for denying prayers for the dead: which was to be ſhewed by me. And if for this opinion disjunctively, yet not for denying prayer for the dead in his ſenſe; which was to be ſhewed by him. And therefore upon the whole matter, we cannot *ſubmit* to Tradition as

*infallible*: because this Tradition, in the Roman sense, bears false witness of its self: nor to the Church, if it fallibly pretends infallible Tradition. Neither can *prudent reason* make infallible assent; unless the conclusions could be better than their premises. Prudent reason were more apt to make Science; which they have no cause to be inclinable to neither: because it is more opposit to their implicit Faith.

And he hath no cause therefore to say, *How many true Beleevers commended in Scripture cannot give so prudent a reason for what they believed?* Ans. All the reason of Faith which can be given, if we take Faith in the acception of an infallible assent, must be grounded upon infallible principles: if any *believed* upon other account, it was not properly Faith; and therefore it cannot be said in propriety of the notion (which the Romanist also stands upon) that they believed. Secondly, If he takes Faith in a looser sence for an assent upon humane Authority, this is not to the question; and we can allow Tradition its influence hereunto. Thirdly, If he means that they could not give a more *prudent reason for what they beleived*, as to others that should ask them a reason of their Faith; this we can yield as to universal Tradition, that by the inartificial Argument of Authority we can give no more prudent reason than by Tradition. But this doth not hit the question, whether the testimony private of the Spirit of God makes not a better assurance of Faith to our selves, though this is not demonstrable to others, that we have this assurance by the Spirit of God. Therefore fourthly, This will not do the business, unless what he saies, he proves from Scripture. We have urged the contrary in the example of the *Beræans* and the term [believing] in Scripture is not seldom taken not of an internal act of Faith subjective, but an external profession of faith objective. And so *Simon Magus* is said to have believed.

Here

Here he gives us occaſion to wiſh he had done ſo before as he does here, in putting his ſenſe into ſome form, thus; *Faith being an infallible aſſent, controverſies concerning Faith cannot be determined ſo as to end them effectually, but by an infallible living judg who can hear you & me, & be heard by you & me: but no other than the Church can (with any ground) be held to be this living Judge, therefore ſhe muſt be held to be the Judge.* Anſ. Firſt to the major, and we ſay that it begs the queſtion in two Suppoſitions; Firſt, That there is a neceſſity of controverſies in points of Salvation. And ſecondly that it is neceſſary to Salvation, that all controverſies (though not in points of Salvation) ſhould infallibly be determined: When theſe two ſuppoſitions are ſufficiently made good, we ſhall grant him the major; and yet then alſo that infallible Judge is yet bound to judge by law of Scripture, κατὰ τὴν ὑποκειμένην ὕλην. And then as to the minor: we ſay ſecondly, This ſpeaks for the Church univerſal; which then, according to my Adverſaries Principles, ſhould alwaies have a true Pope and a true ſtanding General Council; or elſe we ſhould think God had not provided for his Church *ad ſemper*. Now if it be ſaid ſome controverſies may ariſe which are not ſo neceſſary to be decided in order to Salvation, then he deſtroys his major, which goes in part upon that Suppoſition; and ſo in this he is one of us. Therefore thirdly, We can retort his Argument, *mutatis mutandis*; *Faith being an infallible aſſent* requires an *infallible Authority*. But the Church is not yet proved to have an infallible Authority; therefore it muſt be the Scripture. Fifthly, If he means his infallible Living Judge of the Roman Church, we deny that this Judge *will explicate all doubts*: for how hath it ended all controverſies in the *Trent* Council? Indeed that Council hath made more, about the ſenſe of ambiguous definitions: and therefore though his major propoſition were true *de poſſe* (which yet we deny

upon the former conſiderations) yet we were to ſeek *de velle*: and then ſhould we be never a whit the nearer.

And as touching that Text (whereby he would prove that the Bible cannot end all controverſies, becauſe it cannot end the controverſie about it with the Arrians) *theſe three are one.* We ſay firſt, in ingenuity, he needed not to have taken notice of it. Secondly, We ſhould not by right have diſputed the ſubject of the queſtion, whether this or that be Scripture or not: Our diſpute is about the predicates of ſcripture. Thirdly, the Arrians were ſufficiently condemned by another Text, as before: and therefore there is no ſuch neceſſity of the queſtion. Fourthly, We rather believe the Church than the Arrian herein: But let it be put to the pinch; and there were more Faith required in it than the matter afforded; can the Church determin it by her own Authority infallibly? If not, why doth he raiſe the duſt? If it can, why is it not formally done? Therefore either this Text hath not given neceſſary occaſion to an infallible Judge: or the infallible Judge hath deceived us in not taking the occaſion.

And therefore to put his other diſcourſe into a ſhorter and better forme; thus, whatſoever requires infallible aſſent muſt have an infallible Authority. *Diverſs points not propoſed clearly in Scripture*, the Church requires an infallible aſſent to, therefore ſhe muſt have infallible Authority; we anſwer, granting the major; (which yet they have no reaſon to urge unleſs they had more firm Principles) that the aſſumption may be true *de facto*, but not *de jure*. And then again, It is yet denied that ever the Church Univerſal did ever exact this. As to the right hereof, ſhe muſt prove her infallibility and Authority too hereunto; as to the fact, it muſt be proved by our Adverſaries. Therefore ſince I am reſpondent, I may conclude thus, Things neceſ-

ſary

ſary to Salvation are plainly ſet down in Scripture: thoſe points are not plainly ſet down in Scripture, ſaies he, therefore I conclude, they are not neceſſary.

Here he makes a return to my Argument againſt him, that if that muſt be Judge which can hear him and me, and be heard by him and me; then Tradition is thus excluded from being the Judge: here he diſtinguiſheth, *It is the Church who propoſeth theſe Traditions, and not the Traditions, which are our judge.* Anſ. This is eaſily taken away, for according to their Principles, Tradition muſt be Judge of the Church: If their former Argument be good that we muſt not ultimately be aſſured in point of Faith by the Scripture, becauſe we do not know what is Scripture but by the Church; ſo alſo we cannot ultimately be aſſured in point of Faith by the Church, becauſe we cannot tell which is the Church but by Tradition. And if it be Judge of the Scripture in the Canon of it, as they muſt ſay, then ſurely it may be Judge of the Church, becauſe (as before) by the *Fathers* opinion the Church muſt be proved by Scripture. Again by Tradition was the Faith of Chriſtian Doctrine bred in the minds of the Barbarian Nations as we have it ſaid before, by my Adverſary: therefore Tradition muſt be the infallible Judge, or elſe they had not the ſame Faith which the Roman contends for, by an infallible Judge; or if they had, then there are more infallible Judges: or Faith may be had without an infallible Judge; or Traditions and the Church are all one; and then the diſtinction is none. And yet alſo this anſwer of his I did provide for before in theſe words, *but you ſay the Church doth determine hereby (by Tradition) then may it determin by Scripture more ſecurely and more univerſally.* And to this he replies nothing: but holds the concluſion. N. 18.

From hence he skips to anſwer me about that which I oppoſed to his Judge excluſively to any other, I urged that

that of St. *Paul* that an heretick is condemned by himſelf: "namely, (as I diſcourſed) by the Law of God "within him by vertue of Conſcience, which can and "does, and ſhould apply the truths of God to "the cenſure and condemnation of errour in us &c. To this he ſaies, *he is not an heretick but an infidel, who is told by his own Conſcience that he gain-ſaith the Scripture.* Anſ. Firſt, Then the Scriptures are ſo clearly the Word of God that an Infidel may be told thereof by his own Conſcience. If not ſo, then his words have no ſenſe: If ſo, then may we ſee the Scripture to be the Word of God by its own light, as the Heathens did the Law of nature; and then he contradicts his own former diſcourſe. Secondly, Saint *Paul* ſpeaks not of an Infidel, but (in *terminis terminantibus*) of an heretick, who ſuppoſeth the Scriptures to be the Word of God; though by conſequence he denies it in Hypotheſie, as to the point of hereſie. So that the Text cannot be ſo put off. And though every Chriſtian is *readier to die than to diſbelieve any one ſaying of the Scripture*; yet the heretick who ſuppoſeth the Scripture in *Theſi* and in general, may yet deny it in the application againſt him; and for this he is to be rejected, becauſe he goeth againſt his own Principles of Scripture, which do condemn his hereſie in his own conſcience, though outwardly he oppoſeth. And he helps his cauſe no better with another ſhift, *when St.* Paul *wrote thoſe words, the whole Canon of the Scripture was not written; and until the whole Canon was written, your own* Doctors *grant the Church to have been the infallible judge of controverſies.* Anſ. If he takes [whole] ſo as to be underſtood in order to the *Canon*, I grant that the *whole Canon* was not then written: but if he takes it in oppoſition to a ſufficient direction by what was then written, I deny it; there was then as much written as was ſimply neceſſary to Salvation: for how could St. *Paul* otherwiſe

ſay

ſay to *Tim.* That the Scriptures then were able to make him wiſe unto Salvation? thus I diſtinguiſh of the former part: but then 2. the latter I doe deny, that our own Doctours do ſay that the Church was the infallible Judge of controverſies, until *the whole Canon of the Scriptures was written*: for then the *Magiſterium* of the Phariſes had been infallible. No; the word of God was infallible when it was not written, but not the Church. Therefore he miſtakes the purport of finiſhing the Canon, which was not ever held by us to ceaſe the infallibility of the Church, but to accompliſh the matter of Scripture; and ſo it doth exclude *verbum non Scriptum*. Infallibility of the Church was never held: but the Canon of Scripture was allwaies ſufficient, providing allwaies that the Church in this conſideration be meant contradiſtinctly to the writers of Scripture.

Neither needs he to wonder at my ſaying that *the Church then was not ſufficiently formed thereunto*; namely to a definition of what was to be held therein. To this he ſaies, the Church was formed *before* St *Pauls converſion, and before his converſion the number* of *Deſciples was multiplied*. Anſ. The terme [Church] is very ambiguous. He takes it here of the Church vertual, or of the Church repreſentative, or of the Church diffuſive. The Church vertual, which the Ieſuits ſay is the Pope, was not yet formed. The Church Repreſentative as they ſay in a Council confirmed by the Pope, was not yet formed. There was no council General till after three hundred yeares; nor Pope ſo ſoon, in their ſenſe. A Church diffuſive there was: but this ſerves not his turn: for we muſt ſpeake of ſuch a Church formed ſo, that the heretique ſhould be condemned for contradicting the definition of the Church. Now the definition of the Church according to my Adverſary, is by the Church Repreſentative, and this was not then formed.

Then

Then again, to take his own words; either the *Church was not then formed moſt compleatly with all things neceſſary to infallible direction to the true faith*; or it was. Let them now ſay which they will. Then no neceſſity of Pope and Council, yea no neceſſity of Pope or Council. If it was not compleatly formed, then my former anſwer obtains. And beſides if he had been condemned by himſelf becauſe by the Church, then had he been condemned by himſelf extrinſecally to himſelf; or he and the Church muſt have been all one: therefore whether he had the doctrine from the Church, or immediately from any one of the Apoſtles; yet was he condemned by that doctrin as being impreſsed upon his own Conſcience. So that I have as much as I can deſire by this diſcourſe, namely that, is poſſible for us to be Judged and condemned within our ſelves of Hereſie, without an externall Judge: which then was not fully and exactly I am ſure conſtituted according to the mind of our Adverſaries; although, in purity of doctrine, the Church was better then, *then ever ſhe was ſince that time.*

N. 19 In this he begins more ſolemnly to tell us what he means by the *name of the Church*, and wherein conſiſts the power of infallibility in a *Decree or definition of the Church*. And firſt he tels us who are to be excluded from a deciſive voice, Children and women and laymen and inferiour Clergy, thus he proceeds firſt by excluſions, as they do in the choiſe of a Pope. And then he goes on by way of a *γένεσις* and ſo he makes the ſubject of the power of this Decree to be the prime paſtours & Prælats of the Church, aſſembled together in a lawfull General Council with their Chief Paſtour and Head the Biſhop of *Rome*. This the progreſs of this Paragraph. Well, but our queſtion is of the prædicate, whether the Church thus conſtituted is infallible in its Decrees, and therefore ſince he here hath no argument, he hath bound us not to have an anſwer. And yet may we note, that if he means the

the formation of a Church to be thus, we can more clearely contradict him in what he said formerly, that the Church was formed before St. *Pauls* conversion. It was not so formed. And yet 2. We may as well dispute here the subject of the question [whether the Church thus formed is infallible in its decrees] as he disputes the *an sit* of Scripture, when we were upon the prædicate whether the Scripture be sufficient to Salvation. And surely I may do this legally, because I am a respondent; and I may do it also more boldly, because I know they cannot make good the prædicate, that this Church is (thus formed) infallible in its Decres. And as to his exclusions then we could confront him with the opinion of *Alphonsus de Castro*, who would have had a chapter against him for his exclusions: since he maks the acceptation of the diffused Church to be necessary to inerrability. And as to the *Chief Pastour and Head*, he speakes it *cum privilegio* surely, as if not only what the Pope said was not to be questioned, but also what is said of him. They will never prove that there ever was to be any such *Chief Pastour* and Head of the Church universal, *de jure* nor can they ever prove that there was *de facto*, any one so called, till *Boniface* the third, who had the Title granted him by *Phocas*. But *non fuit sic ab initio*. And the rule is good, *Errores ad sua principia reducere est refellere*. And therefore either the Church was not allwaies infallible, or was infallible without Councils, because for above three hundred yeares was no General Council; and therefore why doth he urge the necessity of Councils unto infallibility? And when there was Councils afterwards till *Trent* Council inclusively either the Councils were fallible with a Pope, or might be infallible without him; because till *Boniface* the third there was no such Pope as Head, or Head as Pope. And therefore why do they urge the necessity of a Pope for their infallibility? This he did *in χειν* in

before: and now should have been proved; since he knew that this is not granted on both sides, as the Scripture is to be the Word of God.

And he that is a *seeker of his religion* will never find the Pope to be in the Church, as a King in his kingdome; who is no part of the representative properly. And if he would have the Pope no more than part of the Representative, he should be no more Head of the Church than as a Speaker in an Assembly. And how should he be then the Church virtual, as the high Romanists doth speak of him? And therefore the Pope in the time of the *Trent* Council would not suffer that title of the Council to proceed, that it should be called the Representative, because though he and his Courtiers esteemed him the Head of the Church (and so should have been superiour to the body of the Church) yet he conceived that they intended to take him in confusely in the Representative, and so to exclude his Head-ship. But secondly, He then allows a man to be a *seeker of his Religion*: then he doth allow him that liberty (which he sometimes hath disputed against) namely to exercise his judgement of discretion in matters of Religion; for he would have him *most prudently* judge himself *bound to to joyn her (the Church) in Faith, being convinced that she directed most securely in Faith.* So this is the sense: they allow discretion to joyn with them; but not to differ. Thirdly, Should he be *bound to joyn himself* to the whole Church, or not? If to the whole, then to that part locally which most agrees with the whole in Doctrine, and discipline, and practice. But then can he not *most prudently* joyn himself to the Roman Church, because that hath gone away from the Catholique in all those particulars. And therefore we may conclude it to be our wisdom to find our direction in Faith *most securely* in the Scripture.

N. 20. This number he spends in the power of Councils: To such

such power I made exceptions, he would here remove them. The first about the uncertainty of the irregularity of the Pope. To this he saies, *he to whom the Church submitteth in calling the Council, and whom the Church admitteth as her lawful Head, to preside,* he is right; *these acts do supply all defects in the election.* But first, Suppose he be not a Priest. Can the Churches submission or admission of him make him a regular Pope? And this, That he is a Priest, they cannot be sure of by certainty of Faith, according to their Principles, unless they had an omniscience to know the intention of the Ordainer; and whether he was a right Bishop or not. Secondly, If so, then *Cajaphas* was a right High Priest, as before: and yet he erred with the Council. Therefore a Pope with the Council may erre. *Caiaphas* was submitted to, was admitted by the assembly of the Jews: but this before.

And as to that he saies, put the case *of a Pope defining with a lawful Council, and then prove him fallible, if you can.* We answer, First it seems then he would not stand to the maintaining of a Popes infallibility without a Council. And so then he and the Jesuits must differ in the point of infallible direction. Secondly, If the Pope be not infallible without a Council, then is it not infallible in a Council. What will they here say, Is he infallible without a Council, as the Jesuits say; or with a Council onely. If not without, then not with. My reason is this: because without the infallibility of the Pope, we are not sure of the legality of the Council. For though we suppose an assistance of the Spirit of God to Councils: yet can we not be assured whether to such a Council in particular; this is yet a question; because we cannot tell whether it be a right General Council or not; not by certainty of Faith surely, unless the Pope be infallible in determining this to be a right General Council. Thirdly,

Take the former propoſition of his, He to whom the Church ſubmitteth in calling the Council, and whom the Church admitteth as her lawful Head, ſo as *to preſide*, he is right. Thus he in effect and terms moſt what; and then we make an aſſumption to it. This was in the four General Councils; The Chriſtian Emperour, he did call them; he did preſide in them, therefore where is his concluſion? Fourthly, General Councils are fallible though they do not erre: It is poſſible that they may erre, and therefore are they fallible. Well but more, The *Trent* Council did erre, the *Trent* Council was a General Council, according to them; therefore the major is proved already: they erred in the Latin Bible: they erred in half Communion: they erred in point of merit; which is not ſpoken excluſively to more.

As for the 3. exception he refers me to *Bellarmin lib. 2. de concil. cap. 19.* that *although a Council without a Pope cannot define any article of Faith, yet in time of Schiſm, it can judge which is true Pope.* Anſ. firſt, How could he ſay that the Church is ſo direct a way that fools could not erre; (as before) when yet he will ſuppoſe ſuch a time of Schiſm and *Bellarmin* too, *quando neſcitur quis ſit verus Papa*, when it is not known who is the true Pope. Well then during the time of the Schiſm who ſhall determin emergent controverſies? Neither is the Council called; and what a tedious debate amongſt them may there be to determin who ſhould be next to Chriſt, and if the Council ſhould be as long in calling, and as long in being as the *Trent* Council was (forty three years in both as ſome account) how many might be damned in their direct way? or elſe it was not ſo perillous for ſome controverſies to be undetermined infallibly. Yea, but if ſo, then why do they ſo much preſs a neceſſity of a living Judge for deciding all controverſies? According to the vehemency of their plea, and

and the neceſſities of the Church, the Living Judge ſhould not only be alwaies infallible: but this infallible Judge ſhould be alwaies living. But ſecondly, During the time of the Schiſm, how ſhall we do for the Calling of a true Council? To this he ſaies, for this *the Prelats of the Church might and ought to meet upon their own authority and aſſemble themſelves.* Anſ: Then the power of calling Councils is not abſolutely in the Pope; but in *actu primo*, it is radicated in the Prelats, though bound from the ſecond act by uſe of their Church unleſs in failing. Then a ſupream Eccleſiaſtick Authority is not by divine inſtitution ſubjected in the Succeſſour of St. *Peter.* And then what becomes of their Monarchy: It ſeems then that Fabrick is not built upon Gods ground, becauſe no practice can hold good againſt a divine inſtitution. And thus the Head of the Church muſt ſhake: at leaſt the Jeſuits will ſhake their heads at this Doctrine. If there be an abſolute neceſſity of a true Pope to call Councils, then that which he ſaies is not good; if but of conveniency, then we may end the controverſie, becauſe either all controverſies are not neceſſary to be ended, or may poſſibly be ended without their Head of the Church.

In the next place he toucheth then upon my exception againſt infallibility *quoad nos* of General Councils, by reaſon of doubtfulneſs of their lawfulneſs upon the calling of them; ſince in the old time Emperours called them, not Popes. His anſwer now is, *Your Church which never had nor ſhall have General Councils, is to ſeek in all things belonging to them, our Church in every age ſince* Conſtantine, *hath been viſibly aſſembled in General Councils, &c.*

*Urbem quam dicunt Romam, Melibe putavi,*
*Stultus ego huic ſimilem noſtræ.*——

Therefore he does well to give us a kind check for our preſumption of thinking our Church comparable with

with theirs. First, We do not arrogate to our selves a power of calling General Councils: yet we may know what belongs to General Councils as well as another particular Church. And time was when *Anselm* had by *Urban* some comparable respect in the honour of being called as Pope of the other world. And secondly, As for their Church to have been *visibly assembled almost in every age since* Constantines *time*; if he understands it as called by the Roman Authority, it is denied. And therefore what makes this for them, since their Church was not visibly assembled, as comprehending the whole, but *pro tota parte*, as another particular Church; In the *Nicene* Council their Church had no real superiority, though it had a titular priority *de ea Ecclesia quæ Roma est*, as *Nilus* speaks, because that was at first the Imperial City. Thirdly, How was their Church visibly assembled in the fifth General Council, when their Head would not come to the Council upon the debate of the *tria Capitula*? and yet the Council is to be accounted good without the Pope, yea against him; or else the number of Councils must fail.

What he saies about Emperours is inconsiderable, *It is out of Scripture evident that there is no divine institution by which, either Emperours be assured to be still found in the world; or that when they have that dignity, they be by divine Institution invested with a power to call Councils.* Ans. First, We may then prove a negative out of Scripture, by his first words; and to be *evident* too; which yet were not good, if *verbum non scriptum* were good. Secondly, We by the same law prove a negative to Popes in the same tenour. Thirdly. As for Emperours, we have more for them in the proportion of Kings: for we have a promise for them that they should be nursing Fathers, and Queens nursing mothers; which surely was accomplished by the first Christian

Christian Emperour. Yea the term of Kings was then common for Emperours. Yea had not the Kings of the Jewish Church Divine Authority in matters of Religion; *Cur ita fatus?* They had not only *Arma* to defend it, but *Leges*, to rule it, they were not only Protectours of the Church, as they are called in the *Trent* histories, but governors. and by these were the foure Generall Councils called; namely by the Emperours without any contradiction of Councils. Did the *Nicene* Council question *Constantines* authority to call Council, whether it was Divine or not? How many humble expressions and actions of respect and subjection did come from the Councils and the Fathers, which are not indeed suitable to the deportment of that Pope who trod upon the neck of *Frederick the Emperour*; or of him that threw the Duke of *Venice* under his table with the dogs? The competition then betwixt Emperours and Popes in point of Ecclesiastique authority, as to the outward part of Religion, will come to this. No institution of Popes, in their sense, by Scripture. There is under an Evangelicall promise an appointment of Kings to be nursing Fathers and of Queens to be nursing Mothers. And in *Triumphum*, we might compare them as to the practice of the primitive times; there was calling of Generall Councils by Emperours; none by Popes till they usurped. Therefore *Oliam* to the King may endit, *Tu me defende gladio, ego te defendam verbo*, do you defend me with the Sword? I will defend you with the word. This to his first answer.

*Secondly as for the Prælates of the Church we can shew Divine institution*, Acts 20. 28. *Bishops placed by the Holy Ghost over all the flock; to feed or govern the Church of God.* And Ephes. 4. *Not lay Magistrates but only Ecclesiastical are said to be given as by Christ for the worke of the ministry* &c. Ans. First I think that the adversaries living would goe near to starve if they would eate nothing

before

before they proved that *feeding* there should be understood of governing; as it must be, unless he spoke in a proper disjunctiveness, when he said [feed or govern] and if so he gives us leave to take it not for him, who must get out of it the sense of governing, this indeed is laboured by *Bellarmin* specially; and he contests much for it with *Luther* in his first *b. de Rom. Pontif.* 15. *ch.* Upon that which is said to St. *Peter* by Christ, feed my sheep. His argument is from the term ποιμαινειν which sometimes signifies to rule: right; but it doth not follow that it should therefore signifie so there upon the 21. of St. *John.* we may therefore confront him with a stronger argument. βοσκειν is twice used there, ποιμαινειν but once. Now βοσκ doth not signifie to rule; therefore we should rather expound the other word by these, then by it self. And as for his instance out of the second *Ps.* 9. ver. where he would have the Hebrew to bear the same sense, he is mistaken or worse (as I think I have noted before) for the Hebrew word there doth not at all signifie to feed, but to break, it is not רעה but רוע as in *Ben Israels* edition. And by others though it be not read with a Vau, yet there is a cholem; and *Montanus* renders it [*conteres*] thou shalt break. So then as to the former Text, *Acts* 20. 28. It can no way be proved that ποιμαινειν, there is to be construed to rule, which is only to their purpose. Yea *Montanus*, and the Translation of the Syriack, and of the Arabick, and of the Æthiopick, render it not by *regere* but by *pascere*. Yea 2. Suppose that the word therefore doth signifie to govern, yet doth it not therfore follow that the Text should be understood of Bishops of proper name; but may be understood of simple Presbyters and without any derogation to Episcopal government; because they have a power under the Bishops to rule their particular Churches; namely their particular flocks, although they have no power

over

over the other paſtours as the Biſhops have, who ſucceedeb the Apoſtles in the point of government as St. *Jerom* ſpeaks in his Epiſtle to *Evagrius*. 3. Suppoſe the verbe be to be underſtood of ruling, and ſuppoſe that Text to mean, as ſome, proper Biſhops (taking πρεσβυτερους in an higer notion) yet my Adverſaries will be yet diſappointed of their end by that Text, becauſe we have found Divine inſtitution of Kings and we cannot find in this Text an inſtitution of Biſhops to be above them in calling of Councils, and ordering the outward part of the Church. Yea 4. if that Text doth intend a power in them, by the Holy Ghoſt, of calling Councils, then for ought I ſee, the power muſt be primarily ſubjected in them and not in the Pope; and therefore he muſt not be the chief paſtour and Head of the Church; which contradicts them: if then they intend by the Text a proof of ſuch a Divine inſtitution of Prælates to govern the Church as to call Councils thereby, this derogates from the Pope: And if they intend not ſuch a power to be given to the Prælates as to call Councils; how doth this prove that the Pope is to call Councils, from this Text? Yea how do they prove that Kings or Emperours are not to call Councils: for though Prælats are to govern the Church, Yet Kings or Emperours might call Councils, theſe are not oppoſits but agreeable; becauſe the Prælats may govern in *ſacris*, the Kings or Emperours *circa ſacra*. The ſpeculative deciſion is to be by the Prælats: the outward adminiſtration by the Emperours. The *poteſtas* in *actu ſignato* in them; in *actu exercito*, in the Emperours.

And as for the other Text *Eph.* 4. We need ſay nothing; or only this, that the not naming of Lay Magiſtrates there, doth not exclude them elſe where. Doth it? If it does not, where is their argument? If it doth, then by the ſame law of conſequence there are

no Prælats to have any Divine Authority for the good of the Church, becauſe where it is ſaid, Kings ſhall be the nurſing Fathers and Queens the nurſing Mothers, there is no mention of Eccleſiaſtical Prælats. So then let them ſpeak no more of the Fathers of the Church. And then 2. This comes not to the point of the queſtion, that Lay Magiſtrates are not here ſpoken of but *only Eccleſiaſticall are ſaid to be given us by Chriſt for the work of the Miniſtry*; for to the work of the miniſtry no man aſſerts the power of a Lay magiſtrate, but external government is contradiſtiguiſhed to the work of the miniſtry; which conſiſts in miniſterial acts. Yea 3. Is that Text to be underſtood of government of the Church? If it be not, then it is impertinently produced. If it be, then by his former argument, the Pope is excluded, becauſe here is no mention of any appointment of him *ſub ratione ſingulritatis* and in way of eminencie, nay not of any priority: and therefore he by this account in all his *Pontificalibus* is but an human Creature. Therefore upon the account of the Text we will ſtand our ground, and *not be carried about with every wind of doctrine.*

*Thirdly the Emperour is not by Divine inſtitution Lord of the Chriſtian world, the power of the chief Paſtour of the univerſal Church is coextended to the univerſal Church.* Anſ. Firſt *Dato*, ſuppoſe there were by Divine inſtitution (which will never be proved) a chief paſtour of the univerſal Church, yet the Emperour might be Lord of the Chriſtian world too in his external faculty. And therefore this concludes not. 2. this Language was not knowen till *Boniface* the third, in the ſeventh century. The Roman Biſhop had the honour to be called the Biſhop of the firſt Sea orſeate. And yet not the firſt Biſhop in way of juriſdiction, 3. The Emperour may be as much Lord of the Chriſtian world by Divine inſtitution, as well as the Pope: for both are by election

election, the Pope is to be chosen by Cardinals, which cannot shew a Divine institution. But then also he allowes *Political proceeding from a temporal power*: yet he will not have it to be *an Ecclesiastical calling, such an one as the Pope called them by at the same time.* Ans. Not Ecclesiastical subjective, but Ecclesiastical objective it was. And yet also *Rex est mixta persona cum Sacerdote.* And therefore it may be the Hebrew word *Cohen* signifieth both Magistrate and Priest. Order, and freedom, and time and place belong to the Magistrates administration. And as for the Pope (in their sense) his giving an *Ecclesiastical* call at the same time it is utterly denied; unless he could give a call before he was borne. And as for the Bishop of Rome, he met at Councils upon the same order with the rest. Such things he should have proved rather then said. And therefore that was falsly spoken by him that the *Politicall proceeding was subservient to the Ecclesiastical.* Ans. *Nm entis nulla accidentia.* There was no such Ecclesiasticall call by a Pope: for there was no such Pope. And 2. Though the Emperours calling was serviceable to Ecclesiasticall affairs, yet the Ecclesiasticall persons that met were servants to him therein. And Bishops of *Rome* have not abhorred such acknowledgements herein. And whereas some Romanists have compared the Pope to the Sunne, and the Emperour to the Moon; though some Popes since have eclipsed the Emperour: yet some Emperours before have not only Eclipsed the Pope, but have put him out.

Therfore had he good cause to say, *Peradventure sometimes Emperours might adventure to call dependently of the ratification of the Supreme Pastour.* Ans. surely there is more due when Adversaries will give so much. *Nimia perfectio parit suspicionem.* But this will not content us, there was no real entity of such a *Supreme Pastour.* Nor was he so much as then *Entis rationis.* No; the foure Generall Councils, *a primo ad ultimum*, were menaged

in the call and *ratification* by the Emperours. They gave them not onely *countenance* and a *vote in point of belief*, but also their external establishment. They began and ended them. *Idem est principium destitutionis & constitutionis*. So the *Niceno* Council was called by *Constantine* the Great. The Council of *Constantinople* was called by *Theodosius* the elder. The Council of *Ephesus* by *Theodosius* the younger. The Council of *Chalcedon* by *Martianus*, and by them they had their confirmation. And so Councils are to be called, as our Church in the 21. Article.

The fourth answer he passeth here.

As to the fifth answer, he saies; these Elections do appear by *authenticated* testimonies, *and confirmation*. Ans. But their Election may not appear free thereby. That which may appear in the fact, may not appear in the qualities. And therefore if it were not free, it were as well no Election, *as if the Council be known notoriously to use such proceedings we are not to acknowledge it for a lawful Council*. And this puzzles and disturbs our assent more. Infallible assistance of the Holy Ghost in Councils is necessary to infallible Decrees: this they suppose. In Councils unlawful there is no infallible assistance of the Holy Ghost: this they must grant; and in effect here he doth, otherwise how can we disacknowledge any Council, or not *acknowledge it for a lawful Council*? Now then since a Council may by *such proceedings notoriously known* nullifie it self, how shall we be certain whether a Council doth not morally forfeit its assistance? Although *idem est non apparere et non esse*, as to outward censures: yet this is not enough for an infallible assent of the Decrees to have a charitative opinion of lawful proceedings. If I be deceived in my charitative opinion, no ill consequence: but if I be deceived in my opinion of the Council, I wrong my self in misgrounding my Faith.

In

In point of charity no man is bound to infallibility; but in we point of Faith we are, & therefore I do not well see can ever be ascertained of the infallibility of a Council, how unless we be ascertained of an impossibility in the Council to lose the infallible assistance. For as we cannot believe the Church's infallibility in one point, unless it be infallible in all according to Mr. *Knot* & my adversaries late Principles; so we cannot be assured of the lawfulness of any one Council by the certainty of Faith, unless we can be assured of the lawfulness of all. Now then if they can infallibly inform us that every Council shall have infallible assistance, we will not discuss at all that which cannot be, namely whether it hath forfeited the priviledges by such proceedings: but though it hath not forfeited its moral being by such proceedings, we yet want a proof infallible whether so or not; and then if not, whether it shall have infallible assistance. For ought I know the Holy Ghost may be said to preside there and yet not rule; as *Bellarmin* in his 1. *B. de con. cap.* 18. saies that the Pope in a Council may be considered as President or as Prince: as President, so he is to follow the major part; as Prince, so he can rescinde all. Now which hath the Holy Ghost following the major part, or the Pope; Is the Holy Ghost tied to the Council, as the Heathens fastned their Gods to their Cities? No they will say: not to all, but lawful Councils. But let us then know by the Holy Ghost which Councils shall be lawful. Otherwise, though infallible direction will never deceive us, we may be deceived in infallible direction; since there is acknowledged by him a possibility of *humane malice and weakness, and factions, and bandyings, and domineering self-interest.* Unless they can prove an *extrinsecal over-ruling providence promised by God against humane malice, &c.* to all Councils, I shall never be sure whether they are not in any one. And therefore that general Text, the

*gates*

*gates of hell shall not prevail against* the Church, will not infer infallibility in a Council, unless it could infer infallibility of the lawfulness according to them; and yet not so neither according to us, that Text is made good to every member of the Church invisible: and is that therefore infallible? If it be, why then is infallibility arrogated to the Church visible as the onely subject? if it be not, then the Text doth not prove absolute infallibility; but onely security against damning errours or practice. Not that the Church visible is not a mean of that security; but therefore not a mean universally infallible, but with specification. Sixthly *you ask*, how *shall ignorant people be divinely perswaded that the Council is General.* To this he answers by giving us the means or signs of this knowledge; First *publique Summons.* Secondly, *publique appearance of Prelats made upon these summons from all parts of the world.* Thirdly, *publick setting, publick subscribing, publick divulging their Decrees and Definitions acknowledged truly to be theirs by all present, denied by no man to be theirs with the least show of probability, no more than such an Act is denied to be the Act of such a Parliament.* Ans. Is here all? The question was how *shall ignorant people be divinely perswaded that the Council is general.* And now we must be answered with a probability. If that which may be known probably be known divinely, *eo ipso*, upon that account, then a probable Argument may make an infallible conclusion. And why then do they urge infallibility of the Church for point of Faith, which they can never prove? If less would have made Faith, they should not in prudence have combated for infallibility. But as long as the conclusion follows the worse part; and the effect doth not exceed the cause; and the assent cannot be higher than the ground of it, this answer of his is too short for the question. Secondly, were not all these necessary conditions of a General Council

Council belonging to the *Trent* Council? And why then was not the French Church perſwaded to take it for a General Council? Why doth the French Church ſay, *tranſeat concilium Tridentinum.*

Therefore that which he ſaies is not ſo, that *all theſe motives make it evidently credible to the ignorant and to the learned that this is the true definition of the church.* It is evidently credible to neither. So that though the Definition of the Church were infallible in it ſelf, as they ſay Scripture is; yet is it not infallible to us, as they ſay Scripture is not without the Church. Therefore though the Definition were infallible yet cannot they thereby prove the Council infallible: but they are firſt to prove the Council infallible, then that which is a *true definition of the church*, will be infallibly true, becauſe truly infallible.

So that he needs not tell us that if we *beleive all her Definitions to be true*, we will *alſo believe this Definition to be true*; ſince a particular is included in an univerſal. But before we believe all her Definitions to be true, we muſt demand ſome infallible aſſurance that ſuch a Council is truly univerſal; and that an univerſal Council, is truly infallible. Otherwiſe we may believe one Definition, ὅ. τυχε to be true: and yet becauſe not propoſed infallibly, we cannot believe all her Definitions to be true. And therefore hath he not extricated himſelf out of *inſuperable difficulties.*

As for the *Hypotheſis* of the *Trent* Council, which, I ſaid, was contradicted by the French Catholiques, he ſaies *their Definitions concerning Faith were never oppoſed by* France. Anſ. Oppoſition is formally indeed in contradiction. But if they were denied onely, it were ſufficient to us. Do my Adverſaries think they may be ſaved, notwithſtanding this denial? This ſurely they deny not. Well then, if they may be ſaved notwithſtanding their denial, then we may be ſaved

alſo

also, though we do not subscribe some definitions of a Church. Then we are not bound absolutly under danger of damnation to believe all definitions of the Church. Then the Church hath not infallible authority. But 2. their withdrawing of their assent must draw in one of these two things, either that it was not a General Council (and this *interpretativi* makes a contradiction) or that General Councils are not infallible: and this in effect makes a contradiction too. Yea 3. Did not the King of *France* write to the *Trent* Council under the name of a *Conventus*; which they construed in derogation to a General Council? As appears in the *Trent* History. And 4. As for the distinction of the definitions concerning faith, as if they were not so disliked, *but some things ordained for practice seemed less suitable to the particular state of that Kingdom*, This runnes out as it comes in. For those things towards practice were ordained by the same Divine authority: were they not? Or did not the Holy Ghost assist them as to things of practice? If not, then proper obedience is not due to Councils, because proper obedience respects things of practice: but indeed the whole Council was rejected in gross; and therefore when Cardinal *Ossat* me diated for the King of *France* with the Pope, and the Cardinal urged the peace for him without the condition of accepting the *Trent* Council, he wrote to the King what the Pope said one morning to him, because he would not receive the Council, that he had no more rest that night then a damned soule in *Ossat's* Letters

And as to the seventh answer concerning some in the *Trent* Council who had Titles of Bishops; Bishop *Iewell* affirmes it in his *Apol. Par. 6. P. 62. 5.* and he names St. *Robert* of *Scotland*, and Mr. *Pates* of *England*, And the former is named in the *Trent* History to have been a Bishop of the post, if we may say so of him for his ability,

ability in riding poſt ſo well. And if forty Biſhops do all agree in the ſame point of faith (as for a good while there were not many more) what can be be concluded againſt a poſſibility that they might be all ſworne ſervants of the Pope? And he, that will read the *Trent* Hiſtory will finde ſufficient cauſe not to ſuſpect but to believe that Council not to have had due moralities, much leſs infallibility. His beſt way then to ſecure a Council againſt irregularities, is, by the aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt, *that nothing ſhall happen deſtructive of ſecure direction* Anſ. this is not ſufficient that nothing be deſtructive of ſecure direction againſt damnation (if he means it now ſo) but againſt all errour, for, this he is ingaged to make good, by former denying of that diſtinction of errour damnative and errour not damnative. Yet here he ſeems to warpe in this point. 2. The morality of the Synod is antecedent to its infallible aſſiſtance. Then we muſt have all defects of legality and proceeding removed, before we can be perſwaded of its infallibility. 3. why did he except againſt *Cajaphas* for not being the true High Prieſt, if now *Cajaphas* may *Propheſie, not knowing what he doth, before the ſpirit of truth, ſent to teach the Church all truth, ſhall faile in his duty.* So then notwithſtanding there be not a legall High Prieſt, the ſpirit of God ſhall infallibly act the Council, as he did the Apoſtles. But here is a double duty for them, firſt that the ſpirit of God doth now infallibly teach the Church in all definitions. And then a ſecond, that it is his *duty* to do ſo. Let them learn their duty not to tell God his duty. Did the Holy Ghoſt do his duty when *Cajaphas* and the Aſſembly condemned Chriſt? And why did not the Holy Ghoſt make eight hundred Biſhops in *Ariminum*, as infallible without a Pope, as the forty Biſhops in the *Trent* Council, whereof ſome might be made Biſhops, not becauſe they did not *differ* from the reſt, but that they might not *differ* in the Roman *Faith*, though againſt the Catholique

faith? And if they put the difference in this compare upon a Pope in *Trent* Council, none in *Ariminum* (though that answer will not serve as before) since Prælats have also a power of calling Councils (as my Adversary before) in some cases, why should not the Holy Ghost rather assist eight hundred Prælats without a Pope, then forty with?

As to the eighth answer, he confesseth the substance of it, that for the first three hundred yeares there was no General Council, and tells us the cause; *for persecution no Council could be gathered*, But this satisfieth not, God is not wanting in necessaries, nor abundant in superfluities, as one of theirs saies. If councils had been allwaies necessary, he could have provided against persecutions, or for a Council notwithstanding. And why not in time of persecutions, as well as in the times of the Apostles? Were not those times of persecution?

Neither is that a sufficient reason *because all this time the former doctrine of the Apostles remained so fresh, and so notoriously; the Tradition of the Church diffused, and there remained also so universal a respect and obedience to the Chief Bishop of the Church.* Ans. these three causes will not make one sound one. For by the first he means the known doctrine of the Apostles as delivered in writing or not; if so, then why may not we by the same cause sufficiently be directed by the word written. And as to the second, if he joyns *Tradition of the Church as notoriously* diffused, as a social mean of the direction, it may be denied upon this account only here, for that other Traditions of Hereticques were then mingled in the Church with pretense of coming from the Apostles. And therefore the Traditions of the Church was *notoriously* not distinguished. And as to the third, it is *notoriously* false that then there was a chief Bishop in their sense in those times. For how then could equal [illegible] be appointed in the *Nicene* Council

Council, if the Bishop of *Rome* had been Chief before? how could St. *Cyprian* have said that all the Apostles were equall, *pari consortio præditi honoris & potestatis*? How could the *African* Council have then cut off appeals to *Rome*. Then had there been no need of the feigning of a Canon to this purpose in the *Nicene* Council. How could St. *Ieron* have said that the Bishops succeeded the Apostles *in communi*, in his Epistle to *Evagrium*? Neither was there such obedience then performed by them to the Prælats in all places, as may appear by the Epistle of *Clement* to the *Corinthians*; where he speaks of great Schisms. And also by *Ignatius* his earnest exhortations of submission to them.

*whence the Quartodecimani although they opposed nothing clearely set down in Scripture were judged Heretikes for opposing the doctrin of the first Church, made evidently known by fresh Tradition.* Ans. First if they will believe their *Alphonsus de castro*, they were not sententially declared Heretikes, because they were excommunicated. Indeed *Victor* would have excommunicated them, *& fecisset, nisi Irenæus illum ob hoc redarguisset*; he would have done it, if *Irenæus* had not chid him for this. By the way then was this also obedience to the chief Bishop, to chide him? So *Alphons.* in his 12. *b. de hær.* In *verbo pascha.* Yea 2. They may know that *Eusebius* doth give an account of the *Asian* observation to come from as good Tradition, as the the other. And surely the *Asian* Church was therfore the western; and therefore was it not the *doctrin of the first Church.* Yea also by the way how was Tradition of the Church notoriously diffused when there was Tradition against Tradition? And herein also did the Brittish Churches (which *Tertullian* speakes of) differ, from the western, following the Eastern Church. 3. Heresie is some times largely taken and doth then respect Schism of proper name; and so in a large sense it might by some be called Heresie,

although the matter of difference was no doctrin of faith. *Ex verbis male prolatis oritur Hæresis.* So Hereticks in a propriety of speech they could not be. 14. *Alphonsus* doth distinguish here upon in the same place, and saies they were accounted Hereticks not because they did simply observe it then, *sed quia ita esse necessario faciendum credebant.* And this then alters the case. And he explains himself further, because this did include a necessity of observeing Judaical ceremonies even after Christ's his coming. And so then this was contrary to the word written. And then this was not a Tradition. 5. They here shew the pride of *Rome*, to offer to cut off from her comunion all those who were of the other perswasion (who were not few, as may be seen in *Eusebius's* 5. *B.* 24. 5. *Ch.*) for a thing simply of free observation; wherein difference makes no, variance, as *Irenæus* sent word to their *Victor. ch. 6.* Η διαφωνια τ. νηστειας προ τ. ὑποκειται τ. ὁμονοιαν τ. πιστεως Custom the difference of a fast (and so of a feast) doth commend the agreement of faith. He goes on, *now as the Church could want Councils for so many years, so it could want Councils for the short space of schism.* Right. But then so can it want Councils still: and therefore God hath not bound us over to the Church for our absolute direction upon necessity of Salvation. Councils are necessary to infallible direction; so my Adversaries hold: The Church for three hundred years and in time of a Schism can want Councils, as my Adversary here: so then there is no absolute necessity of their infallibility. And indeed there was much need of Councils in that space of the first three hundred years, in regard of Divisions, as since; and then if God provided sufficiently for his Church without them, he can and will do so still. And this is confirmed by my Adversary by these words of his, *for the necessity of new declarations is not so frequent at least in any high degree of necessity, calling for instant remedy, and re-*

*remedy of this nature only.* And he may goe on and ſay it not upon my opinion, but for himſelf, and *ex animo*, that *Scripture alone will remedy this neceſſity.* He needed not to put in *you ſay.* And as to that which he ſaies, that there remained *many definitions of former councils*, and *Traditions of the Church which alone ſerved Gods church*, theſe we have ſpoken to ſufficiently before. Either the Definitions were concluded out of principles of Scripture; and Traditions were agreeable to the ſubſtance of Scripture, or not: if ſo, then they hold their virtue by Scripture: If not, they remain under debate whether they were infallible. Neither is Tradition before Scripture to be confounded with traditions after Scripture. We can grant more to the former than we can to the latter; both in the ſubſtance of the matter, and in the manner of certification.

And for the time after the old Teſtament was written, he doth well to ſay that it *remained almoſt ſolely and alone to the Jews.* For what was *Iob*? and why might not others of the learned Gentils travail for divine knowledge, as well as *Pythagoras* and *Plato* and *Orpheus* into *Egypt* as *Iuſtin Martyr* ſaith of them.

Ninthly he anſwers to the cauſe put of a Pope's differing from the Council upon a queſtion; he ſaies, *nothing ſhall be deferred*; and yet no peril. For if it were neceſſary to have a *preſent definition, the Holy Ghoſt would not forget to inſpire the parties requiſit to do their duties.* Anſ. Again, What neceſſity then of every controverſie to be ended? Secondly, How ſhould the people know whether the buſineſs required a preſent definition. Surely they may know by this, that it did not require a preſent definition, becauſe if ſo, *the Holy Ghoſt would not have forgot to have inſpired the parties requiſite to do their duties.* Well then alſo we can ſay, that we may be as confident that what is not clearly delivered in Scripture doth not require a full definition, becauſe if it had, the Holy Ghoſt would not have forgot

to

to inſpire the Pen-men of Scripture *to do their duties.*

In the tenth anſwer he is very ſuſpenſive how to declare himſelf in the point of Eccleſiaſtical Monarchy. He ſaies, a Monarch in ſome Nations *couldnot do all things without a Parliament.* But he thinks himſelf on the ſurer ſide, that he is *ſufficiently aſſiſted when he defineth with a Council.* Anſ. Firſt, why do they not ſpeak out and tell us which is which? The Church can end all controverſies, as they ſay, but not that capital controverſie about the Church. That whereby all things are to be made manifeſt, is that not to be made manifeſt? We muſt ſee all things by the light, but the light muſt be private. Do they declaim againſt private Spirits; and will not let us publiquely know the power of the Pope comparately to a Council, and yet they together muſt be the ſubject of publique Authority? And why do they tell us that the Scripture cannot prove it ſelf, and therefore we muſt not reſolve our Faith in that: and yet we muſt reſolve our ſelves in the Authority of the Church, and yet the Church cannot tell us where this Authority Supreme is, or will not? And it is all one to us, for we are in the dark as well by their want of will to ſhew us light, as of power. But ſince it ſeems we may be ſaved in the opinion of the Jeſuit, or in the opinion of the Sorboniſt, we draw this advantage from it, that notwithſtanding we know not infallibly which part of the contradiction to hold in points of queſtion, we may yet be ſecured againſt damnation, *pendenti lite.* And what controverſie is of ſuch moment for an infallible Judge, as who it is? Secondly, Infallibility may be in one as well as in many; ſince it comes by the aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt, then if they think God hath provided abſolutely the moſt plain and expedite way for the direction of his Church, this muſt be placed in the Pope without a *Council.* I hope, the Holy Ghoſt needs *no Council*; which cannot

ſoon

ſoon and eaſily be made in all the eſſentials. And therefore he ſhould not have compared the Pope with a *Monarch*; but he ſhould have compared upon this reckoning, a Monarch with the Holy Ghoſt. Then though a Monarch *could not do all things without a Parliament*, yet a Pope might do all without a Council: becauſe the Pope ſhould be infallibly aſſiſted by the Holy Ghoſt, as the Apoſtles were; but they do not think ſo of a Monarch. Again they think that the Pope is of divine inſtitution; and that a King is meerly a creature of the peoples, and therefore he that hath a divine inſtitution muſt needs have more divine aſſiſtance. Again *when he defineth with a Council*, he defineth not ſo much as Head of the Church, but as a Biſhop *in communi* with the reſt; as indeed anciently the cuſtom was; and this derogates from the Monarchy of the Church. And if he had a priority of order, this doth not infer a priority of Juriſdiction over all the Church; which *Pelagius* and *Gregory* Biſhops of *Rome* abhorred.

Eleventhly he ſaies *not one Council* have been oppoſite to another. Anſ. This propoſition in terms is not true. The Council of *Conſtantinople* under *Leo* the Emperour decreed againſt Images. The ſecond Council of *Nice* decreed for them. And what do they think of Pope *Vigilius* his judgement betwixt the Council of *Chalcedon* and the fifth Council of *Conſtantinople* about the Epiſtle of *Ibas* whether it conteined hereſie or not? And is not the African Council againſt Appeals oppoſite to the *Trent* Council, which adds to the Catholique Apoſtolique Church the Roman, as making the Roman to be *omnium Eccleſiarum matrem & magiſtram*; of all Churches the mother and miſtreſs. But this hath been touched before.

He goes on. *In the Nicene* he, (the Pope) *erred not, as you will grant, nor in the three next General Councils, as the Church of* England *grants*. Anſ. He ſaies well, He erred

erred no: in the first *Nicene*. But this antecedent will not make a conclusion or consequent, that therefore he hath not or cannot erre in others. It followeth not from a negative surely of one act to a negative of the power; they are to prove that he cannot erre, which is infallibility. But secondly, We say also that he could not erre in the other General Councils neither as Head of the Church, because he was not Head of the Church. He might have erred as a Bishop of *Rome*; but as Head of the Church he could not erre; not that we do assert him to have been Head of the Church; but because we say he was not Head of the Church; and therefore could not erre as such.

He goes on, *He subscribed not in the Council of* Ariminum, *how then did he erre in it. Yea because he subscribed not, that Council is never accounted lawful by any but Arrians.* Ans. He seems now to come to terms more moderate. Before he speaks of Councils to be confirmed by the Pope: Subscription is less; and more general. Every confirmation includes eminently a subscription; but every subscription makes not a confirmation. For they will not deny that other Bishops were wont to subscribe. Secondly, they may know that the 5. council of *Constantinople* went for good without his Subscription; nay notwithstanding what he published for the *tria Capitula*, which were condemned in the foresaid Council. Therefore if they have no better answer (the other Council being held good without his royal assent, yea notwithstanding his opposition) there will be another instance of a Council opposing a Council: namely the Council of *Ariminum* opposing the Council of the first *Nicene*. But thirdly, As to his reason why it was not acknowledged a lawful Council, *because he subscribed not*; I deny it upon *Sozomen* his account in his 16. *B.* 23. *ch.* if he takes his not subscribing, as he seems to do, for the only cause. For he (*Sozomen*) saies there

μὴ τὸ ῥωμαίων ἐπισκόπου, μήτε τῶν ἄλλων συμβαίνειν δεῖται· ἀλλ' ἐὰν ἅπαντες ἀντιλέγωσιν, οὐκ ἐπὶ τοῖς τοῦτο ποιοῦσιν ἡ ψῆφος ἔσται,

because neither the Bishop of the Romans, nor others did consent to them, & because many did dislike those things which were decreed by them. Had they then in the council of *Ariminum* decreed according to the *Nicene* Fathers, the council of *Ariminum* might have passed with St. *Austin* (notwithstanding the Bishop of *Rome's* not subscribing it) though not comparatively to the proof of Scripture: but we see here in this testimony three particulars against them. First, That he is here called the Bishop of the Romans: Not the Bishop *significanter*, nor the universal Bishop, nor the Bishop of the Church. He hath but his share with the rest, and limited by local Jurisdiction. Then how can they say that the Bishop of *Rome*, is the *chief Bishop and Head of the Church*? Secondly, We see here, that the Consent of others concurs towards the making of a Council lawful. And therefore the consent of the Bishop of *Rome* is not that which is the form informant of the Council, nor that which legitimates it. And thirdly, We see the reason, in part at least, to be, because they disliked those things which were decreed in the Council of *Ariminum*. And therefore if it had been a full meeting and consented to, yet had been exceptable against in regard of the matter, for surely the presence of all and their Subscription would not have made that matter to be good which was naught. For then they had declared that to be good which was not; and this had been an errour. Therefore though we receive the four General Councils, we are not bound to receive the Decrees of every Council, because we do not receive the Council simply, but do receive the Council for the Doctrine, not the Doctrine for the Council. Therefore upon the whole matter he had no great reason to admire my instancing in the Council of *Ariminum*.

Neither doth it follow that becauſe one Council hath erred, therefore every one. Therefore that which he ſaies may be falſly reported, that ſome *tax the councils of all ages of errours againſt Scripture.* Every one may erre without any impoſſibility. Some have ſhewed a poſſibility by errour. But any ones poſſibility doth not inferre any ones act, much leſs of all. And if any one ſhould have ſaid ſo, they are acquainted well with their own anſwer, they are but private men that ſay ſo.

And why doth he tell us of *Mechanicks*, that ſpeak diſreſpectively of all Councils? Let them firſt anſwer for ſome body of their black coate who ſaid the Scripture was as a Noſe of Wax. They make to us a need of the phraſe, *Quod erat demonſtr.*

As to the twelfth anſwer, We have had the ſubſtance of it alſo before. The incruſtation of it makes it not ſolid. It doth no way follow that becauſe their firſt Council Acts 15. ſaid, *It hath ſeemed good to the Holy Ghoſt, and to us*; Therefore every Council even lawful ſhould ſay ſo. This is to be proved, not propounded. And let *Ferus* their own give them the reaſon upon the fifteenth of the *Acts*. Let them either make it good that every aſſiſtance is infallible, or that every Council had that aſſiſtance which is infallible.

And their poſtulate, that *Anathemas* ſhould conclude infallibility in their Councils, is denied them. Secondly, They bind more unto peace than Faith. And ſo their form in the *Trent* Council is, *Si quis haec attentare preſumpſerit &c.* If any ſhall preſume to attempt theſe things, &c. Thirdly, Neither is there ſuch danger by them, unleſs every one were bound to ſubmit his aſſent. Yet me thinks the *Trent* Council doth ſpeak in their beginnings ſomwhat more modeſtly of their Synod, "*in Spiritu Sancto legitime congregata*," lawfully gathered together in the Holy Ghoſt.

Every

Every meeting infallible is lawful, but every lawful meeting is not infallible.

As for his thirteenth Answer, he takes into a consideartion that of *Nazianzen* touching Councils: And he would distinguish, that he did not *speak of a lawful free General council called and directed by the chief Pastour of the church presiding in it*. So then: He doth despise all Councils but such, doth he not? Yes they will say presently. Then he despised all Councils; for there were none so called, so directed, so presided in his time or before, nor presently after. The fifth Council of *Constantinople* (which was about 553. under *Justinian* the Emperour) did sit and determin without and against *Vigilius* the Bishop of *Rome*. And secondly, As to that he saies, that *Nazianzen's* speech did respect the times of the Arrian troubles, which St. *Basil* takes notice of, we say suppose it: yet this also makes a prejudice to all Councils in the time of the Arrian heresie, because it is very like that several close Arrians might in Council mingle with the Orthodox. And thirdly, It is *λόγος ἀσυλλόγιστος*, if he concludes from a respect to Councils in the other Fathers unto an asserting of their infallibility. A *genere ad speciem non sequitur affirmative*; because they gave them some respect, therefore such as imported their infallibility, it doth no way follow. Fourthly, Neither doth *Nazianzen's* respect to the *Nicene* Council contradict him here: For although that might proceed well in his opinion, yet speaking *de communi*, and *ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολύ* he might say as he said. Neither doth it appear that he imbraced it upon its own authority intuitively, but because he approved the Doctrines, otherwise why should not eight hundred Bishops in *Ariminum* be as credible, as not half so many in *Nice*? But it may be that the conclusions in the *Nicene* Council were Prophetical; and the discourse of those of *Ariminum* was fallible. Yea,

but they will say that the Discourse in the *Nicene* Council was fallible, though the conclusions Prophetical. Let this be proved and we have done. But the *Nicene* Fathers as before, professed that they proceeded by principles of Scripture in their determinations. And so *Bellarmin* is driven to confess in his 12. *l. de concil. Sed ex verbo Dei per ratiocinationem deducunt conclusiones*, they deduce their conclusions from the Word of God by discourse. Let *Bellarmin* then answer *Stapleton*.

At the latter end of this Section, He takes me up for a saying of the Bishop of *Bitonto* in the Council of *Trent*. And he is confident that that account of him hath no credible ground. Ans. Surely as good ground as *Bxierly* had for several passages which he produceth out of our Authors. And if some of theirs have professed to take testimonies upon his credit, because they had not Books by them; I may be easily excused for asking the question whether the Bishop of *Bitonto* did not say so and so in the Council of *Trent*. He that asks a question seems to be wary of asserting. And if the opinion of one able Doctor be sufficient to make a point probable, as some of them have lately said, this point of fact is not altogether unprovided of some hope of probability. My Author is Bishop *Jewel*, who speaks it more than once in his *Apology*.

Neither have they cause to bragge that their Church *have been the men, who were still imployed in the upholding the Authority of Councils*. Surely my Adversaries did pass by *Cajetan, and Bellarmin, and Valentia*; and did not take notice of what they have said towards fallibility of Councils even lawful, that so infallibility and Monarchy might be necessarily devolved from heaven, as a [illegible] into the Pope's lap. All that make perstriction of the Authority of Councils are not heretiсks, it seems, because some that are good Roman Catholicks do speak of

their

their fallibility; so, that this infallibility should be intailed upon the Bishop universal. And so they differ from my Adversaries platforme of infallible direction: In this he shewes himself highly displeased for offering to compare the Determinations of *Trent* with the word of God. He thinkes *it fine doctrine that determinations of Councils should be examined by such as I and he is.* Ans. it is halfe an argument for us that they are angry at this: But first we donot speak of an Authoritative examination, which is forensical, but a rational inquiry which is for private satisfaction. 2. If the Decrees of that Council be indeed infallible, they will abide the test: if not, how can we believe them; Do they think, 3. That we are more bound to believe the council of *Trent*, then the *Bereans* were bound to believe what was said by St. *Paul*, without discussing; since specially they are pleased in the *Trent* Council somtimes to joyn St. *Paul* as partner with St. *Peter* in the honour of their Church? 3. We may surely finde more cause to examine the *Trent* Council then some others; since it hath not yet obteined in the Christian world the reputation of a lawful General Council: therefore though we doe not examin others yet this we may. 4. would they not have us preferre the doctrin of *Trent* before any differing from it? yes surely; then we must inquire into it, and privately judge it: otherwise we make a blind choice. Fifthly, If the consent of the major part, which is most immediatly considerable in a Council, should morally bind, why should we not as well believe the Council of *Ariminum*; since what else he hath pretended against it, is not cogent? Sixthly, If they think that one cannot think well of a lawful General Council, unless he believes their infallibility, that proposition is easily denied. They may be fallible, and yet not faulted by me in *piety* or *prudence*. Infallible conclusions do not follow upon moral principles. The one makes

them

them careful, the other faithful: but though they do not deceive me, they may be deceived themselves. And if their infallibility did depend upon their piety and prudence, how are we infallibly certain of that upon which their infallibility should be grounded?

Nor does my consideration of a Council betray in me a want of *charity* or *humility*, as he supposeth: they have themselves as Disparates to Theological Faith; and are not of the same Conjugation. Humility disposeth me to think of my self meanly; Charity disposeth me to think better of others, because I know my own imperfections and do not know anothers perfections, as *Aquinas* notes: But if these were dispositive unto Faith, yet not causal: If causal of Faith, yet of Faith humane, not divine; unless I did see Gods Word for believing men. This is the τὸ κεντρον; if they can prove this, we have no more to say. Until then I can love my Adversaries, and think humbly of my self: And yet cannot be perswaded that my Adversaries are infallible. And if they were infallible in the dispute, how should infallibility be the prerogative of the Council confirmed by the Pope? So then as long as I can give reverence to a Council without present Faith, I am not *posed*, but they who must beg the question.

In this he chargeth me with shifting, because I said now, *let us not see the opinions by infallibility: but the infallibility by your determinations*, whereas else where I say, you should go *a priori* and shew that your Church *is infallible, and therefore her definitions to be admitted.* This in effect he supposeth to be my shift to evade his pressure of me. Ans. No such matter. Good cause for both distinguish reasons and respects. First, I hope they think it lawful to urge both waies in a different kind of discourse, we demonstrate the effect by the cause; we know the cause by the effect. Secondly,

the

The way a *Priori* is more distinct, and therefore this would presently make an end of the controversie, if it could be effected; because it satisfies us in the cause. Prove the infallibility, and then we fall down or rise up to the definitions. They are then to be taken *ipso facto*; and they produce Faith *ex opere operato*, as we may speak. This the way of nature: But when they cannot make this good, then the other way, and *quoad nos* is to shew us their infallibility by their determinations; and an easie way it is to us to shew them the unlikelinesse of infallibility by their determinations. For it is sufficient to the negative of infallibility, to find one errour in any of their definitions; but it is not sufficient to them for the affirmative of infallibility, to prove that the Church hath not erred in some particular definitions. The latitude of the power is not discharged by some acts.

*Quem sæpe transit casus aliquando invenit.*

If it hath erred but once, we are sure it can erre, then infallibility is destroyed; if it hath not erred in some, yet it doth not follow that it hath not erred in others. Yea, if it hath erred in none, we cannot *ex vi formæ* conclude infallibility, unless it be proved that the power of erring is bound in the Church Representative, as the Schoolmen say the power of sinning is bound in the Church Triumphant. Thirdly, We are now upon the *Hypothesis* incidently; and so it is very reasonable for us to go this way with them; because a particular Church hath not the priviledges of the universal Church. It is generally supposed that the universal Church cannot erre in things necessary; but this is not granted to any Church of one denomination. Now the *Trent* Council belongs to a particular Church, and therefore as to that, our way of proceeding is not irrational. And therefore all that he saies *upon this argument* comes to nothing. If all the strength of *Rome* can sufficiently

reinforce

reinforce the former Texts against us for the Church universal, and then for them, *reducant nos*; if they cannot, *redeant ad nos*, as the Father said.

N. 23. This Section is in good part made up of repetitions towards the purging on their behalf 1. *Ep.* to *Tim.* 3. 15. How much Paper is taken up with petitions and repetitions; petitions of the principle, and repetitions of what was said before. Upon this I distinguished of a double Pillar; the Principal, Scripture; a subordinate one, the Church. And now he saies pleasantly, *this double dealing in distinguishing helpeth you not. The Church must still be a true Pillar and ground of truth.* Ans. Distinguishing is plain dealing; double dealing makes confusion. Therefore we distinguish again; the Church may be a true Pillar and ground or establishment of truth, *ex officio*, and subordinately; yet not infallible. That which is infallible is such; all that is such is not infallible. *Dic aliquid contra ut simus duo.* He should have contradicted or said nothing. *The people believed God and* Moses *saith the Scripture*; right: But the copulative doth not alwaies equally reduplicate the act to diverse objects. In the Proverbs it is said, *Fear God and the King*: yet the King is not to be feared equally with God. So they believed God and *Moses*, in the curt fashion of Hebrew speech: But they did not believe *Moses* as they did God. God for himself upon his own veracity; *Moses* for God. Now let them prove that God speaks by the Church, as he spake by *Moses*, and we have done. God spake to *Moses* face to face. Did he speak so to the Church? He spake then to *Moses* immediatly: doth he speak so to the Church. He spake to and by *Moses* who was King in *Iesuron*, *Aaron* was formally the High Priest: Doth he speak so now to and by civil Magistrates? If he does, where are the priviledges of the Church, which they vaunt of? If not, why do they urge that Text?

Text? It is true, *Rex eſt mixta perſona cum Sacerdote*; but this maxim is not for them: Their maxim is inverted, *Sacerdos eſt mixta perſona cum Rege*. *Moſes* morally wrought miracles; ſo does not now the Church. If *Xaries* could indeed have wrought miracles in the *Indies*, why did he corrupt the Goſpel? In ſhort, when they can prove, that the Church ſpeaks all they ſpeak by Revelation from God, as the Jews believed, that what *Moſes* ſpake, he ſpake from God, then they may apply that Text to God, and the Church, which is applied to God and, *Moſes*. The ſenſe of their believing *Moſes* was, that they believed, what he ſaid, to be ſpoken from God; this is now the queſtion of the Church, therefore they ſhould not have compared *Moſes*, and the Church, but *Moſes*, and an Apoſtle. This had been more Symbolical; but this would not have been ſerviceable. Well then; if they would have been contented with this, that the Church ſhould have been ſubordinate to Scripture, the quarrel would ſoon be ended. What then? Would they have the Scripture ſubordinate to the Church? *Adieone pudorem cum pudicitia perdiderunt?*

So he ſaies, *The Church was by St.* Paul *called the pillar, and ground of truth, without ſubordination to Scripture, as then not written.* Anſ. Will they hold themſelves to this, that what is not ſaid in Scripture in terms, is not to be conſtrued as the ſenſe of the Scripture? If they will, then what will become of their points of difference, as to Scripture? If they will not, then this diſtinction is not to be rejected upon that account, becauſe it is not ſaid ſo there. But ſecondly, His reaſon, becauſe *Scripture then* was *not written*, is to be examined. If he underſtands it abſolutely, it is falſe. Was not the Old Teſtament then written? And if the Romaniſt fetcheth his Monarchy of the Church from the Anaology to the Jewiſh High Prieſt, why

ſhould not the Old Scripture be ſufficient to ſubordinate the Church. And if the Scripture was then ſufficient, as St. *Paul* ſaies, to make wiſe unto Salvation before the Canon was finiſhed; was it not able to bear the Churches dependance upon it? And is it not as able now, when the Canon is compleated? As to the times of the Church before any part of Scripture was written, we have ſeveral times ſpoken before. Put it into a Syllogiſm, thus; That which God ſpeaks we are bound to believe upon account of his veracity. That which the Church ſpeaks to us, God ſpeaks; therefore. Now as to the major, whoſoever denies it is *interpretative* an Atheiſt. The aſſumption then is that we ſtick at, though the Roman accounts us, for this, not Chriſtians: The times of the Church before any part of Scripture was written, were chiefly thoſe, wherein that propoſition was conſented to; and yet not by all that knew the doctrine of the Church. Therefore thoſe who then did believe, had not only a Faith diſpoſing them to believe that what God ſaies is true: For this is ſaid by *Ariſtotle* in effect οὐ καλὸν ἐναντία κεῖσθαι τῇ θεῷ, τῇ πατρὶ ἢ τῇ διδασκάλῳ this is a propoſition of reaſon, that what God ſaies is true, but they had a divine Faith habituating them to the belief that that which was ſpoken by the Church was truly communicated to the Church from God. Now here the hinge turns, whether their Faith terminated upon the Church, as the *ſubjectum quo*, or upon the matter delivered by the Church, as the *ſubjectum quod*. We deny the former, becauſe divine Faith cannot riſe upon humane teſtimony; & therefore Faith could not be cauſed by ſuch a teſtimony which is humane, without a Revelation from God that what the Church did ſpeak, it did ſpeak from God. Therefore the church had it ſelf then towards Faith, as propoſing the matter, not as reſolving the aſſurance. And can we not then as well be now aſſured

that

that what the Scripture doth propoſe is the Word of God, as what the Church propoſed then was the Word of God? And ſo Faith muſt at length not only cauſe us to believe that what God ſaies is true, but alſo to believe that God hath ſaid this, therefore.

He likes not then my reaſon for the ſubordination of the Church to Scripture, *not for the reaſon againſt which other reaſons will ſoon be found.* Anſ. This will require a very good intention, but thus he is pleaſed to put off my diſcourſe. *Bellarmin* proves his propoſitions by Scripture, by reaſon, by Fathers. Therefore he makes his heads of proof, and holds of Faith. And another would ſay that my Adverſaries were beaten out of all their holds. He ſaies to my reaſon here, *againſt it other reaſons will ſoon be found*, when they are found we ſhall find anſwers. Let them tell me from whom the Church hath its authority: They will ſay from Chriſt, Well he is ſuppoſed the Author: But where is the Inſtrument and Patent for our knowledge that Chriſt hath paſſed ſuch a grant? The Church ſaith it, they will ſay. But firſt. The Church Univerſal doth not ſay it. Secondly, who of them hath proved that the Church is *virtus*? they bear witneſs of themſelves, therefore their teſtimony is not true; not in *modo*, if it were true in *materia*. Thirdly, What the Church can ſay amounts but to a prudential motive, or congruous inducement: but what is it which grounds Faith, and binds Faith, and makes it a divine belief, if not what is ſaid in Scripture? Without this what is the Church but a company of men in *naturalibus*. The Roman doth not ſo much believe this or that becauſe God ſaies it; but they believe God ſaies it, becauſe the Church ſaies it. But the Church virtual, in the Pope; Repreſentative, in a Council; diffuſive in the people, ſignifies nothing without religion. The queſtion then is, what religion makes the Church, which we are to be-

lieve. Not reason satisfies us in this, because some principles of Religion dot ranscend reason; and because reason cannot by its principles produce Faith of proper name: then we must have somwhat, which is supposed as a common principle, whereby true Religion is discerned. Not the Church: For the question is, which is the Church. What then, but Scripture? Let them then think upon the former Texts for sufficiency of Scripture, which if they were acknowledged, would save us this dispute. And let them think upon that Text, *Esa.* the 8. the 20. "To the Law and to the "Testimony: If they speak not according to this word, "it is because there is no light in them. That, which is referred to another for direction, is subordinate thereunto; The Church is referred to the Law, and to the Testimony: therefore it is subordinate. If they speak not according to this word as written; it is because there is no light in them.

Another Text may be named; 1. *Epist.* of St. *Peter*, the 1. *ch.* 23. *ver.* Being born again, not of corruptible "seed, but incorruptible; by the Word of God, which "liveth, and abideth for ever. So the Apostle, from whence we thus argue: That, which is begotten of the Word, is subordinate to it; the Church is begotten by the Word. Therefore their argument is retorted by the contrary; For the Word in the substance of it, must be before the Church; because the Church is begotten by the Word; therefore the Church must depend upon the Word, "which liveth, and abideth for "ever: and this better suits the standing charracter of Scripture, than the loose, and fluent, or fluxive way of Tradition. And how comes Tradition into the world? By the first Church, they will say. Well, and how came the first Church to be such? What did they joyn together in the profession of Religion, συντυχίαν, as some say the world came together by the casual concurrence

currence of *Atoms*? The first Church *virtim* was begottten by the Word through the Spirit; so in the *ver.* before, "seeing you have purified your souls in obey-"ing the truth through the Spirit. Then all is to be resolved into the Word: *quod est primum in generatione, est ultimum resolutione.* So *Aquinas*, *Omne reducitur ad principium.* All is to be reduced to the first principles. Therefore they will never reconcile St. *Paul*, and *Irenæus*, unless they admit my distinction of the Church: Then that which *Irenæus* saith will well agree with that of St. *Paul*. St. *Paul* saies, as we commonly read it, the Church is the Pillar, and ground of truth: St. *Irenæus* saith, the Scripture is the Pillar of truth. Both agree, for *subordinata non pugnant. Subordinates* make no warre.

Let them not therefore tell me, that *what God tells me by his Church I am to admit*; this we admit: But let them tell me how I shall infallibly know, that he tells me so by the Church. And let them tell me how I shall know the Church, but by letters of credence, namely in Scripture. How can I divine whether there is to be a Church, and which is the true Church, and which the true Religion, without Scripture? And *Nemo tenetur divinare*, as the saying. So that that, which he saies, *that the Church is first believed independently on Scripture*, depends neither upon Scripture, nor Catholick Church, nor reason. Take Scripture in the matter of it, and that which he saies hath no consistency. In saving Religion there is nothing before it, not only in *signo rationis*, but also in time; because the Church is begotten of the word of God. We deny not, that the Church is made use of to dispose us to faith of Scripture; but this doth not resolve us; because it self, of it selfe, resolvs but into a moral capacity, which makes not faith properly called, not faith Divine, therefore in *Genere Credibilium*, the first proposition to the Church is, that the

Scripture

Scripture is the word of God; and without its testimonies of the Church, it cannot be said to be credible in the sense of divine faith. Therefore if he meanes that the *Church is first believed independently on Scripture*, namely upon the account of humane faith, we may grant it of the universal Church: but what is this to our purpose, since we are disputing about faith divine? If he takes it of divine faith; this would be to purpose; but that it is not true.

Yet he proceeds, *So he that begins to be a Christian cannot admit of Scripture as men admit of the first principles of sciences.* Ans. Nor do we say so. Ordinarly he begins with prudential motives, from without he useth arguments drawn from out of Scripture; but the question is whether these motives are productive of Faith in him. And he seems to say as much as denies it, because he saies, *in respect of us the Church is first believed independently of Scripture.* So then, the way by the Church is imperfect, as the way of knowledge by those things which are more known *quoad nos*. But in the way of Faith, which makes the assent more firm and certain, we must begin with Scripture upon which the Church depends. To joyn issue then, We at first lead men to the Faith of Scripture by the way of the Church, as the *Samaritans* were led to Christ by the voice of the woman. But Faith doth not rest here; because they who deny the Scripture may deny the Church, and may question its credibility. Therefore since the Authority of the Church doth *de se* terminate its self in the Testimony of men, we would have our Faith by such a way as is proportionable to it, which if it be Faith divine, must rely upon some divine Authority. And this way the Scripture must be more known than the Church, because by the Scripture we know the Church, in a distinct knowledge. And without it can be no more than an *Individuum vagum*. Surely

Surely it is Scripture which makes *Individuum demonſtrativum.* And they are wont to prove it *determinatum*, as in *Petrus*, by the Scripture.

And as for the Criticiſm in the forenamed Text of Scripture to *Timothy* about the Church; all he ſaies is nothing againſt ſo much uſe of it as I made. For I do not argue ſo, becauſe there are ſuch Ebraiſms, therefore this is to be ſo expounded; we ſay it follows not as to an actual neceſſity of ſuch an interpretation: No; but thus it will follow, there are ſuch Hebrew formes of prefacing; therefore this may be ſo interpreted. Now the poſſibility of ſuch an expoſition is ſufficient to my purpoſe: For poſſibility of the Contrary ſtops the mouth of infallibility, If this or that be infallible, it is not poſſible to be any other way, but the ſenſe may be otherwiſe; therefore this is not the infallible ſenſe. ſo we agree with Dr. *Taylor*, whom he quotes; becauſe the Doctor may deny the argumentation as *quoad eſſe*; we intend it ſufficiently *quoad poſſe*. It may be otherwiſe expounded than they ſay; therefore cannot we hereby infallibly know this infallibility of the Church. Suppoſe the Church were infallible; yet if we did not infallibly know ſo much, we cannot make the Church our ground of Faith. Nor could there be any conſiſtence of their implicit Faith, if they did not know infallibly that whatſoever the Church propounds is infallible.

And an exception againſt this interpretation is, that it is new, *unheard of to all Antiquity and unto all men unto this age*, Anſ. This exception would have come better from ſome other, ſince my adverſary had no minde to anſwer me to ſome Authority of the Antient. It were worth the while to quit the Criticiſm upon condition they would hold to antiquity. But whoſe ſaying was that, *Omnes Patres ſic, ego autem non ſic?* And yet neither is this a ſufficient anſwer, unleſs the conſent of the

the Fathers could make a conclusion to be of faith. So then, as the *Florentine* said of vertue, that the shew of it is profitable, but the practice not; so also may it be said of the Italians, that the shew of antiquity is of use to them, but the thing not, but also it will be too hard for every one of them to prove a negative, neither were many of the Fathers Learned in the Hebrew tongue.

He goes on, *whether this infallibility be equall to that of the Apostles, or not, maketh not to our purpose.* Anſ. Surely infallibility never took any degrees with their Doctours. It is not *receptive* of *magis, & minus*, therefore if he asserts not an equall infallibility, he asserts none: less in infallibility is less then infallibility. So then their Church now is not such as to rely upon, equally to the Authority of the Apostles; therefore it must be subordinate to Apostolical authority: which indeed was in effect confessed before in that he granted, that the Church was *regula regulata*. And this is as much, as the cause is worth

He saies, I note him in a Parenthesis, for a *French Catholicke, for allowing infallibility to the Pope defining with a Council.* Anſ. No. He, or his scribe is much mistaken. I asked him, whether he had a minde to the opinion of the French Catholick, because he in one place spake of the infallible assistance of the Church without any mention of the Pope. Now if he did on purpose leave out the Pope in his account of infallibility, then he is like to be a French Catholick: And, although *all Romane Catholicks allow infallibility to a Pope defining with a Council*, cumulative; yet all Roman Catholicks do not allow infallibility to the Pope, only then when he defines with a Council. As some Catholicks do allow full Authority to a Council without a Pope: so some Catholicks allow infallible Authority to a Pope without a Council. And this is more then I needed to have

haue ſaid to him that ſaies in this paragraph ſo little to me.

Yet he will charge me with charging him with an opinion which brings him within perill of blaſphemy. His opinion was this, *God gaues as much infallible aſſiſtance to the Church in a Councel, as he gaue to him who did deliuer his word in Scripture.* My reaſon was this, for herein "it appears that now there is no need of Scripture, ſince "God ſpeaks as infallibly by his Church as in his word. He denies the inference. I maintain the charge more preſſely thus. He that inferres no need of Scripture comes within perill of blaſphemie. He that ſaies ſuch words, as before infers no need of Scripture. Therefore, To the major in effect he hath ſaid nothing, his diſcourſe is bent againſt the matter of the minor, and he would deny it by ſeverall inſtances, which come not up to the caſe in hand. Firſt becauſe *he ſpeaks infallibly by the Church of the Law of nature for two thouſand yeares.* And *why more blaſphemy* now? To this in the matter of it we have ſpoken before. As applied here, we ſhall anſwer to it now. Firſt he did not then ſpeak infallibly by his Church, if the termes [by his Church] be meant reduplicatively to whatſoever was ſaid by his Church; if it be underſtood thus, that whatſoever truth was propoſed by God was propoſed by the Church; it may be more eaſily granted. In the former ſenſe the reaſon were good if it were true, in the latter it may be ſuppoſed true, yet it is not ſufficient to his uſe, who urgeth that nothing is propoſed by the Church but that which is true and from God. Yea 2. it cannot be abſolutly granted in the ſecond ſenſe, if we take the Church to have ſpoken from God in any way of a Councel: for much truth of what was propoſed came to ſome of them by way of prophecy. 3. The termes [God ſpeak infallibly by his Church] may relate more ſtrictly to the Agent or to the Inſtrument,

God spake infallibly whatsoever he spake by them: but God did not speak infallibly by them whatsoever they said. Or thus, the words are true hypothetically, if God spake, he spake infallibly by them; for he cannot speak otherwise: but that whatsoever they said was spoken to them infallibly by God, is a question. Yea 4. Will they think that there is as much reason for infallible speaking by the Church when the Scripture Canon is compleated, as when there was none? As to Gods speaking by Moses, we have spoken to it lastly. As to Gods speaking to some Gentiles by the Church; that was not ordinary; and therefore it hits not our case, neither can they prove that the faith of the Gentiles was not wrought in them by the efficiencie of the spirit of God, notwithstanding they had the object of their faith from the Church. Neither is it now the same case of teaching us infallibly by the Church as at the time when the Apostles *did write*; because the Christian Church was then to be settled upon the foundation of the Apostles as St. *Paul* speaks: and now the building can stand upon that foundation, therefore were they extraordinary officers and lasted but for a time. And yet if they can prove that their Church-doctrine is no other then that which was Apostolical, or that those who bring new doctrine are as well inspired as the Apostles, the Roman Church shall now be Apostolical. And if there were now as great a necessity of the infallible direction of the Church as there was in the times of the Apostles by them, then why should not the Apostolical office have continued in the number of twelve, and so all the Apostles should have had successours? which they must not say who maintain the Monarchy of the Church.

Neither doth that instance of *John* the *Baptist*, teaching the *Angles* which also the Scripture teacheth, come up to the case. First, Because *John* the *Baptist* was but

a

a singular person; but the Church now is considered under a promise of continual succession, and as is pretended by them, with the perpetual gift of infallibility; therefore though there was Scripture then besides *Iohns* Testimony, yet what need of it now, if there be a constant infallibility in the Church? Secondly, There is a difference in the case *ex parte Scripturæ*, in regard all Scripture, which was not then compleated; therefore there might be more necessity of St. *Iohns* Testimony, and of the voice from heaven, and of the Testimony of miracles: But now the Canon is consigned, what need of the infallible direction of the Church; and if there be an infallible direction standing in the Church, what need of a standing rule? it may serve for a *commentatorium*, as the Cardinal. So the Scripture shall give us but an application of the Churches doctrine. The Scripture that must not be a sufficient rule; the Church that is the direct and plain way that fools cannot erre. They may erre by the Scripture; they cannot erre by the Church. Therefore in effect, not only will there be no need of Scripture, but there would be need of none. But more closely, That which is not of use without the Church, and that which the Church may be without, is not necessary. The Scripture is of no use without the Church; and the Church may be without Scripture; Therefore, according to their premises, the Scripture should not be necessary; and how farre is it from blasphemy, to say that the Scripture is not necessary? If to accuse Scripture be to accuse God, as *Niles* before, Then to say there was no need of Scripture, is to accuse God of inspiring so many Pen-men, for no necessary purpose. For although after all means of Faith *still millions do not believe*, as he saies; yet since, according to their doctrine, no sense of Scripture in point of Faith is to be believed, but as taken from the Church; since the Word not written takes up so much

of neceſſary matter, ſince the perfecter and the wiſer are to be ſublimated by traditions; ſince the common people are not to be converſant in Scripture in a known tongue, what neceſſary purpoſe doth the Scripture ſerve to? It is true, *ſuperflua non nocent*, as the rule is; and *utile per inutile non vitiatur*; true. But yet according to their principles, the Scripture will be ſuperfluous. For that which is more than is neceſſary is not neceſſary; that which is not neceſſary what is it? Therefore if any of their men ſhould be found to be *traditores Bibliorum*, as ſome were of old, the Roman Donatiſts would never make a ſeparation from them.

He goes on, *The Church is not more Enthuſiaſtical now than ſhe was for four thouſand years, before ſhe had all the promiſes, which Chriſt made her of an aſſiſtance, which ſhould be at leaſt as ſpecial and full as ſhe ever had before*: Anſ. This is poſitively no anſwer, but ſomewhat by compare, we preſs it. The Church in that time did not *de communi*, challenge immediate inſpiration; therefore that Church which doth ſo now is more Enthuſiaſtical. Secondly, It is a begging of the queſtion ſince there is not now that need after the Canon is compleated. Thirdly, We return them their argument, what aſſiſtance the Church had formerly, it hath now; the Church formerly had not *de communi*, infallible aſſiſtance: therefore not now. For the Prophets and the Apoſtles and the writers of the Scripture are not rationally to be included in the common account of the Church, in our caſe. Let them chuſe which they will ſtand to. If they put them into the promiſcuous account of the Church, let them now ſhew us ſuch a Church; If they account them extraordinary, let them ſhew ordinarily ſuch.

And he confounds himſelf in what follows, *Before ſhe delivered only what ſhe had received by tradition and by Scripture*

Scripture. She hath received Scripture by Tradition too; hath she not? Why doth he then divide Scripture from Tradition in the way of its coming to us? For the chief reckoning they make to us of Scripture is upon the credit of Tradition. But he means Tradition *ex parte materiæ*, it may be; because they think Tradition contains other matter than Scripture equally to be believed. But this is it is *Page 17. In Interpreting which (according to the sense truly intended by the Holy Ghost) the same Holy Ghost doth assist her; so that here is no new Revelation claimed to be made to her, but an infallible assistance to propose faithfully what was formerly revealed.* Ans. He cannot well clear himself of Enthusiasm upon the account of Tradition. Any thing beside the word written equally to be believed is matter of Enthusiasm. But they pretend somewhat beside the word written equally to be believed; therefore are they in danger of Enthusiasm. And I do not see well how they can answer it. But now he endeavours to purge himself of this accusation in point of interpretation of Scripture. They say they do not interpret Scripture by revelation but by infallible assistance. Well. But how shall we blind souls be assured infallibly of this infallible assistance? We may not examine it by the judgment of private discretion; may we? If we may, then this is gained. Must we believe it? Yes. Why? Because God hath it to be his will that we should absolutely believe the Church. Shew me where. By the Church? that is in question. By the Scriptures? what Texts? Those produced. But the question is whether they are rightly interpreted *according to the true sense*. What will they say now? Nothing but the Church hath infallible assistance. And this they must believe by a revelation without Scripture; and this is an Enthusiasm. And the Roman church pretending this privilege above other Churches,

makes

makes it a private revelation. Again, though there are several waies of revelation, yet I would aske how many waies there are of infallible assistance distinguished from revelation: let them tell us or else conclude against themselves that they must have the sense of Scripture interpreted by revelation, because by infallible assistance. The pen-men of Scripture they had infallible assistance: but that was by revelation. Let us know what infallible assistance there is without a revelation: specially since *Stapleton* and some others likely will have the definitions of Councils to be prophetical. If they be concluded by discourse, then are they fallible: if their conclusions be prophetical, then by revelation.

But also these terms [to propose faithfully what was formerly revealed] are somewhat obscurely proposed. Doth he mean it of the sense of Scripture? Then where was it *formerly revealed*? if it was clearely revealed, what need of a Council to see that which others may see? if not, *how* was the sense revealed to them infallibly without a revelation? If he meanes [what was formerly revealed] of Traditions, those are beside the word of God: and therefore these do not belong to interpreting of Scripture. And yet also the Church hath not been so faithful in proposing these, as hath been noted before. Or doth he mean it of traditive interpretations, as they are called? but where are these to be found? who gives us their number formal and material?

Let them then take home to their own Tents those that *claim full assurance by the Spirit in any point*. We differ from them much; first because we doe not pretend any such necessity of ful assurance in every point: but the Roman must; otherwise what need of an infallible living Judge? 2. We pretend not to any prerogative above other Churches as to the knowing the

the sense of Scripture; they do. Therefore they urge that of St. *Cyrill* in allusion to what St. *Paul* said of the Church of the Romans then, for their Church now, that perfidiousness cannot have accesse to them; not considering (besides what hath been said to it before) what *Nilus* comments upon it, that the Apostle spoke it of the παρουσία, not of the παρόντα of the time that was past, not of the future. And thirdly, we do use meanes towards the finding out the true sense: but they must have it by an extraordinary assistance of the Spirit (which needs not means) if they will have it by infallible assistance in places of controversie. Therefore *Stapleton* thinks rationally that conclusions from discourse, cannot be infallible; and therefore he will have them to be Prophetical; and that will be by revelation.

This number receives again my reinforcements of my answer to that Text sometimes about the Church, *the pillar and ground of truth*, as we ordinarily read it. I said it respects the office of the Church, according to the rule of the School-men. He saies again, No, it respects the Authority. And here he does *petitio principii*, for he offers no reason why it should be taken in his way. For as to that which he urgeth here that it is called the *ground of truth*, it is not solidly objected; for the term in the Greek is ἑδραίωμα; that which is to keep firm and stable; the prop, the support, and this fairly imports an act *ex officio*, to keep up, and uphold the truth.

He saies also it suits well with his sense to give order to *Timothy* to carry himself well, that the Church might be thought to be infallible, *so as not to make men believe it improbable that God should assist infallibly such a Church*. Ans. The strength of this Argument himself destroies. He is afraid to make good life an Argument of infallibility; because he saies it is a pitiful

argument

argument, since Solomon the Idolater was afflicted with infallibility. Well, But let them first take my sense with the rule of the School-men, and so compare them with his season, which is but a sinful argument; and then judge whether it be not best to take my account upon the place. Secondly, If badness of life be a prejudice to infallibility, then, since they cannot deny that some of their chief Pastours have been in life *scandalous*, their infallibility will be scandalized, and so cannot be such a way as that *fools cannot erre*, as he urged before? Thirdly, If this satisfies the *multitude*, that those who are to instruct them are of unblamable life: yet this though it be enough *ad faciendum populum*, yet this is not enough to judicious men, who look for satisfaction upon solid principles, nor can this make Faith unto the people of their infallibility, but a better opinion thereof. Fourthly, As for Bishops and Deacons, which he sales should be so qualified (by the order of St *Paul*, to and for *the credit of such a Church*) he does not there find in St. *Pauls* Epistle any Cardinal Bishop, or Cardinal Presbyter, or Cardinal Deacon, in whom the power of infallibility, according to them, should chiefly consist, and therefore that Text doth not positively serve their turn. Fifthly, I had thought infallibility could have defended it self without the credit of a good life, since the grace of gifts, and the gift of grace are two things.

I said moreover what need of such instructions which St. *Paul* gives to *Timothy*, if the Church were infallible, since infallible assistance is immediate. He answers here, this is a *strange consequence*; the Church is infallible in *defending points in a general Council*, Ergo, *no man needeth instructions for his private good behaviour*. Ans. But first, the instructions he gives to *Timothy*, were such as respected him in his place for the ordering of the Church in *rebus fidei*, in

matters

matters of Faith, as appears by the ſumme of Chriſtian Doctrine which he gave him, "*Great is the* myſte-"ry of godlineſs, &c. Secondly, By my Adverſaries opinion there was no ſuch need of inſtructions for a private life, ſince it is a *pitiful argument* to derogate from infallibility by a bad life. Thirdly, Neither was *Timothy* I hope in their account, a *private* man.

After this he hath two queſtions in the clouds. *Was it ſo for the firſt two thouſand yeares before the Scripture was written.* Anſ. This is imediately ſubjoyned to the other before; and therefore ſhould ſeeme to be univocal to it. And then we ſay two things, firſt he ſuppoſeth that which is to be proved, that the Church, in that ſpace, was abſolutely infallible. 2. much leſs was it infallible in Councils, as he now pretends, which then were not, as he now would have them. Therefore from hence it ſhould follow, that if the Church be infallible, it may be infallible without Councils; and this is againſt him. Another queſtion is this. *Or do we perhaps teach this infallible aſſiſtance to be communicated to every one immediately?* Anſ. He ſpeakes gravely, as antient men were wont, with an ἴσως or τάχα, as he notes in his Rhetoriques. But why ſhould he think we think he doe? For the Church, by him, might be thought to be infallible; though *Timothy* was not; becauſe according to him, infallibility is in a repreſentative. And though *Timothy* might have been Preſident of a Council, yet was he not to be (according to my Adverſary) perſonally infallible, but as Head of the Council. Yea he could not be Head of a Council then; for this was, according to my adverſaries, reſerved for St. *Peter*. And yet *infallible aſſiſtance* was *communicated to every* of the Apoſtles; was it not? Then nothing hinders but that it may be communicated to every of the Popes ſucceſſively, which yet, it may be, he declines the affirmation of. And if it be not communicated to

every of the Preists how shall the people be secured from errour by them, so as they cannot erre?

But if they do say *infallible assistance* is *communicated* to any *immediately*, then may they see reason for what I said that *infallible assistance is immediate*: or if all infallible assistance be not imediate, let them shew another species of infallible assistance. To me this argument is good, Apostolical assistance was immediate, infallible assistance is Apostolical, therefore infallible assistance is immediate. No question is made of the proposition. Nor can they make any doubt of the assumption, because they urge as much assistance to the Church now as is Apostolical. Therefore had my Adversary reason to interpret me of such infallible assistance, which needs no instructions: for I know no infallible assistance that doth, as appeares by the argument.

Neither doth his following instance of the Apostolical Council in the fifteenth of the *Acts* evince the contrary. Though their determinations were not immediately inspired in regard of time, or of debate: Yet since this debate was not to them necessary, how can this make a new species of infallible assistance? Likely therefore this Council was in this sort managed by them to be a precedent and example to other Councils, which should not have infallible assistance, to determin presently and prophetically as soon as the question is proposed. And if those who have infallible assistance do use discourse; this doth not conclude an infallible assistance, which is not immediate. He that can prove the creation of the world by principles of Scripture in way of Faith, or in order to Faith, may prove the same conclusion also by principles of reason in order to science.

But then it is said in the preface, *it hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us*. Ans. To this I say, *sine præjudicii*

*præjudicio melioris ſententiæ*, that theſe words do not cogently infert an infallible aſſiſtance of proper name, actuated, for they may bear that account in reſpect to the diſcourſe they made by the effects of the Holy Ghoſt, and former declarations. And this may appear by that of St. *Paul*, 1. *Cor.* 17. *vlt.* "ſhe is "happier if ſhe ſo abide according to my judgment; "and I think alſo that I have the ſpirit of God. This judgment was not given by infallible aſſiſtance, becauſe by no inſpiration: and yet alſo it doth refer to the ſpirit of God: And according to this proportion "might be ſaid, it hath ſeemed good to the Holy Ghoſt "and to us, and yet thoſe concluſions might not proceed from the Holy Ghoſt by way of infallible aſſiſtance. And ſo farr in other Councils the definitions may be ſaid to be by the Holy Ghoſt, as they are drawn out of principles of Scripture, which the Holy Ghoſt did inſpire the Pen-men of it in. Yea 2. Since the meeting of them in that Council was but upon convenience in caſe of Scandal, what ſuch neceſſity was there for that infallible aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt? So then let them take it how they will, either thoſe determinations were not made by them who were infallible by an infallible aſſiſtance; and then is not this inſtance to their purpoſe: or if it was, then are they to prove equall aſſiſtance to all General Councils: otherwiſe extraordinaries make no ſpecies. And I am ſure the *Trent* Council hath not credited ſuch aſſiſtance, as *Stapleton* and *Bellarmin* would claim from the Apoſtolical Council to all General Councils. N. 27.

Here he would make up the breach which was made upon his ſtrong hold for infallibility in Councils by that place of St. *Athanaſius*, as holding the conſubſtantiality of the Son of God to be *the word of God* upon the Authority of the Council. This was ſlighted. He would repair it, but it will not ſtand. That Text,

upon which the *Nicene* Council builded their determination, is made good *th.* 2. *num* 4. In the judgment of the Council it did more then *probably* determin the Controverſie. And if he thinks otherwiſe, he doth not believe the Council; and therefore not their infallibility. His diſcourſe is nothing: He cannot determin it Gods word *with relation to a Text probable in Scripture, therefore he doth it with relation to the infallibility of the Councils authority.* Well, is here all? then turne the tables, He cannot determin it Gods will with relation to the infallibility of the Councils Authority; therefor he did it with relation to the infallible Authority of Scripture, Doth he ſay that the Council holdes it upon account of their Authority, or of the Scripture? then which is it more likely it ſhould be held upon? The Church, or the Scripture? But let them ſpeake thus, when the queſtion is granted.

Another anſwer of mine he doth as good as confeſs, that St. *Athanaſius* did not hold it upon the Council, becauſe he held it before. Here he diſtinguiſheth indeed. He held it *ſo in order to himſelf who was convinced that his interpretation was conformable to the antient doctrin of the Church, yet in order to others* &c. Anſ. He was not Pope, was he? And yet St. *Baſil* ſpeaks ſo highly of him, as if he had ſpoken ſo of the Pope, we ſhould have heard of it: but if he was not Pope, what have we to do to the holding it in order to others? He was quoted for his own judgment; was he not? Then this diſtinction is impertinent. And beſides, if he was *convinced that his interpretation was conformable to the antient doctrine of the Church*, he was convinced that their doctrine was conformable to the true ſenſe of Scripture; if not, why ſhould he ſay that the Council urged Scripture to the *Arrians*? if he was, then he held it before upon that account.

Then again he toucheth upon the Council of *Arimi-*

*num*

*num*, saying that I contend that *Council as well to be believed for it self as the Council of Nice, and you think* &c. Anſ. what I ſpake by way of interrogation [why not] is not yet anſwered by him in the reaſon of it. He wonders that I ſhould urge this Council in way of compare to the contrary: But this gives no ſatisfaction as to my reaſon, that exceptions, it ſeemes, were not ſo availeable againſt the Council, becauſe St. *Auſtin* made no mention of them, but referred the point betwixt them to Scripture. This Council of *Ariminum* was not ſo eſteemed as the reſt: but what then? from whence did this diſeſteem proceed? from the illegality? it ſeems no; for then St. *Auſtin* had had a plea againſt it without waving the Authority of the *Nicene* Council. And ſurely St. *Auſtin* had a very mean eſteem of the Authority even of the *Nicene* Council, if having a juſt exception againſt the Council of *Ariminum* he would not pleade it, and ſo bring in the Authority of the *Nicene* againſt the *Arrians*. But it may be the *Arrians* did not care for the Authority of a Council, and therefore St. *Auſtin* waved the *Nicene* Council. Yea? Then how is the Authority of a Council a Catholick remedy? and then it ſeemes the *Nicene* Fathers determined againſt them, not by their Authority, which they cared not for, but by the Scripture. So then the diſteem of that Council of *Ariminum* was upon reſpect to the matter of the definitions. And ſo a Council was not in their opinion, *ipſo facto* infallible. Therefore he proceeds in a fallacy, if he argues thus, *it was never by the Fathers, no nor by the Church of England numbred amongſt the foure firſt Councils*, therefore it was rejected, becauſe it was not accounted a lawful Council. Becauſe it was rejected, therefore for this cauſe, doth not follow: becauſe the *genus* doth contein potentially more ſpecies. It was refuſed upon diſlike of the matter, it ſeemes, as before. And as for the reaſon why it

was

not lawful, he toucheth not here; and it was cashiered before.

He goes on, *and you might as well think that I might prevaile against you by only citing the Council of Trent* &c. Ans. surely the Council of *Ariminum* in all respects considerable was as hopeful towards infallibility as the Council of *Trent*; it may be more, by a greater number of Bishops; and this with my adversary should have borne some weight; who should think that multitude of Counsellours is halfe an argument of truth; because he would not place infallibility in a singular person, as the Jesuit, but in a Council with the Pope. And if he saies that there was wanting in the Council of *Ariminum* the presence or consent of the Bishop of *Rome*; we can easily answer, that he then had but a single suffrage, and there were some hundreds of Bishops more in the Council of *Ariminum* then were at the Council of *Trent*. Yea also, some Decrees of the Council of *Trent* proceeded without the Pope's confirmation, as before. But I think they are both alike, the Council of *Ariminum* and the Council of *Trent* in being deceived. Only I think that St. *Austin* had less to say against the illegality of the Council of *Ariminum*, then we have to say against the Council of *Trent*: And therefore we may follow St. *Austin*; and if he appealed from the Council of *Ariminum* to Scripture, we may as well appeal from that of *Trent*, if they would urge it. He saies St. *Austin in vaine had insisted upon the Nicene Council against one who scoffed at it*. Ans. Me thinkes, if I may say so, this is not very judiciously spoken; because, if *Maximinus* urged the Council of *Ariminum*, he was bound by equall law to be dealt with by the *Nicene* Council. If *Maximinus* had not urged the Council of *Ariminum*, it had seemed that the *Arrian* had not a perswasion that this Controversie should be otherwise handled then by Scripture.

Scripture. And if he were *well furnished with other arguments out of Scripture admitted by him*, as he it seemes supposeth that he might be, what need then of the infallibility of the Church in Councils? And it seemes it is the shorter way and more expedite against Heretickes by Scripture, as he confesseth in the words following, *that St.* Austin *intended by them only at that time to overthrow him and not to medle with a long contention (fit to fill a book alone) about the validity of the Council of Nice and invalidity of that of Ariminum.*

Put then these things together; St. *Austin* it seemes might be sufficiently furnished with arguments out of Scripture against the *Arrian*; he might by them only overthrow him; it is a voluminous work to prove the legality of one Council, and the illegality of another; the *Arrian* scoffed at the Council of *Nice*; therefore the convenient and easie way of proceeding with and against Heretickes is by Scripture, not by the Authority of the Church. And this *interpretative* is the yeilding of the cause. And yet, if they will yet think Councils, as such, to be infallible, let them think upon that Canon of *Nice* declaring equal ... of the Bishop of *Alexandria* to *Rome*; and let them think of the Council of *Chalcedon* and the Council of *Constantinople*, that the Bishop of *Constantinople*, should be equal in his limits to the Bishop of *Rome*; The Council of *Ephesus* in their Epistle to *Nestorius*, that *Peter* and *John* were of equal dignity. Let them therefore consider well what they have to do; for, if Councils be not infallible, they are in an errour: if Councils be infallible, they are not, because they have declared against them. Let them therefore stand or fall by Scripture. Let them try it so as St. *Austin* did. N. 29.

His discourse herein is fully put into this form, all errours in or against things necessary are plainely determined by Scripture, This infallibility of the Church

is

is not plainly determined against by Scripture, therefore. But *therefore* what? That this is no errour? Nay, that is not rightly concluded, but, that it is not an errour in things necessary. All errours are not in things necessary. Therefore if it concludes as it should, it is peccant in the ignorance of the Elench; for it is enough to us that it be an errour, suppose it were not an errour in things necessary. If it concludes that therefore it is no errour, it concludes falsly. 2. Though the proposition be our doctrine, the assumption supposeth that which is not necessary to be granted by us, that this infallibility of the Church is an errour in things necessary. we do not deny it to be so: but we are not by any arguments constrained to say so. For though we should not hold it an errour in necessaries, yet is it necessary to reject it as an errour, knowing it to be so. And 3. We say to the assumption, that it is sufficiently enough determined against by Scripture namely as necessary to be in the Church, because in the Scripture sufficiency to salvation is asserted without it; as before. And 4. The affirmative should have been proved by them who assert it; not the negative to be proved by us. And as towards his proof of the assumption, that the *Scripture is not so clear against this as for this*, we have nothing to say, because he hath nothing to prove it; *Staurus nega*; it beggs. And we can say better we have proved the contrary.

N. 29. Here he resumes a Text for them, St. *Matthew* 28. *ult.* I made answer to it before, that it doth not extend equall assistance to all ages of the Church. He now urgeth me to shew a Text, wherein the assistance which was infallible in the *first age*, should not be for the Second or Third age; he saies to me, *against your reasons we have our reasons*. Ans. He is here wanting in two offices, first in proving that that Text doth extend equal assistance to all ages of the Church; for

which

which the respondent is to waite with his buckler, it is enough to us that he cannot or does not prove it. But then 2. He is wanting in another thing becauſe he doth not produce his reaſons againſt our reaſons, let them draw the Sword and cut the knots if they cannot unty them. Let them *bring forth their ſtrong reaſons*, as the Prophet ſpeakes. When as then he ſaies, *bring againſt my illimited Text another Text* limiting, we ſay that the cauſe and our office is upon the negative until he brings another Text for his ſenſe, or gives reaſon for it, or gives us the conſent of all ages of the Church, we have nothing more to thinke (beſides what hath been ſaid) then that he had reaſon to ſay more, then what follows, *the neceſſity of the people (which was the prime reaſon why Chriſt gave this infalliblity) was greater in ages remoter from Chriſt*. But this was anſwered to by retortion, that then, Traditions, it ſeemes, now are not to be accounted equally certain. And he anſwers now that which he had better have kept in, He ſaies now, *it is harder to prove now that Chriſt did ſuch miracles, was crucified, did riſe again, then it was preſently after theſe thinges happened; yet all theſe things be as infallibly true now as they were then, and as infallible: ſo I ſay of traditions; which for all this doe not loſe a ſufficient meaſure of infallible certainty*. Anſ, Traditions then were but equall to Scripture, Traditions now are not equall to Traditions then. Therefore they are not now equall to Scripture. And this ſpoyles their Traditions and contradicts the *Trent* Council, which determins that they are to be received *Pari pietatis affectu*. And ſo hath he loſt his hold of Traditions by his own words. Neither will it ſave him to ſay that they are now as infallible as then in themſelves but not to us; for ſo is the Scripture infallible in it ſelf without the Church, as they confeſs, but it doth not ſo appear to us, they ſay. 2. They are to make good, if they can, degrees of

infallible assistance, by the least degree of infallibility.

But to goe on, *what if there be no such necessity* &c. Ans. He seemes to be, towards a *punctum reflexionis* here, well, if there be no such necessity of equall assistance, then my answer to such Texts is the better. And then let them take the rule, which their own do use, *Deus non deficit in necessariis, nec abundat in superfluis*. God doth not abound in things superfluous, nor is wanting in things necessary. But then also if it be not necessary, why have my adversaries so much pleaded the necessity of an infallible judge? Indeed it might be, if God had pleased; and yet not necessary by necessity of consequent; but they are wont to prove it to be, because it is necessary.

He goes on, *Did not the Church alone serve to decide all controversies before the Scripture was written* &c. We answer as often before; The Church is not thence concluded infallible; put it into forme, that which decides all controversies is infallible; the Church, before Scripture was written, did decide all controversies; Therefore it is infallible? No. We first deny the proposition. That which decides all controversies decides them infallibly, does not follow. This cannot be proved; less will not serve them. Then 2. To the assumption, we can deny it, it did not decide all controversies, put case it did decide all necessary controversies, yet not all controversies. And we must have a judge, they say to decide all controversies whatsoever. And 3. If the Church then before Scripture was written did decide all controversies whatsoever, then surely there is not that assistance infallible now given to the Roman Church, because notwithstanding they have the Scripture and Traditions, yet they cannot decide all controversies. If they can, they are not faithfull, and then that of St. *Cyprian* is not due to them

them now, that *perfidia non potest habere necessum.* If they cannot, where is the equall assistance? and then also what was decided by the Church was decided by the Scripture in the substance of it though not then written: so that he had no cause to contradistinguish this decision of the controversies to the use of Scripture.

*Again* he saies, *did not the old Scripture testifie as much as was necessary that Iesus Christ was the true Messias? Yes. to what end then was* Iohn *Baptist sent to testifie this?* Ans. First if the old Scripture did sufficiently testifie of the Messias, then that which I have said concerning the sufficiency of the whole Canon is surely sufficient: if it did not sufficiently testifie, then his argument is none. 2. There is not *par ratio* for the adding infallibility to the Church after the Canon is consigned, as for St. *Iohns* testimony notwithstanding the old Scripture: More might be requisit for the settling of the Primitive Church then after: because the Church after was to be grounded in the Primitive.

But he saies there is as good reason; *In ages after the first when the Church should grow from a grain of mustard seed* &c. This proves nothing unless there might arise such a controversie which could not upon Salvation be decided without an infallible Judge. Let them prove this, and they will say somthing. If not, this will not be to the purpose, that several *controversies* in such a space might arise. And would not the same number of necessary points, material and formal serve as many more thousands of Christians? And those controversies which he names, we have spoken to, nay when they have, as they suppose, an infallible Judge, are all controversies ended? Let them bethink themselves what differences amongst them are yet dependent as before: We waite therefore for the proof of such a promise of *assistance extended to infallibility for other ages of the Church.* It is not enough for him to say, *why might not*

*Chriſt (for any thing you know) thinke this a ſufficient reaſon.* A *poſſe* in the premiſes will not make an actuality in the concluſion. 2. there is a difference betwixt a reaſon after the thing is apparent, and a reaſon to prove the thing to be: if they can ſoundly prove to us that there is ſuch an aſſiſtance given in promiſe to the Church in all ages, then we ſhould ſooner be induced to the acknowledgment of his reaſon. But there is nothing in the reaſon till the reaſon prove the thing. 3. If words in Scripture were to be taken allwaies ſimply according to the termes, what need would there then be of an infallible Judge of the ſenſe of Scripture? Therefore let them chuſe which they will do, whether they will allwaies have Scripture meant according to the uppermoſt import of the letter; if ſo, then the ſenſe of Scripture is plain; which they have denied; if not, then may they admit a limitation of that aſſiſtance ſpoken of *Mattoew* 28. 3. This forme of modality [why might not] ſhould not, one would think, become the high mode of infallible aſſiſtance. This manner of ſpeech might ſerve us againſt their infallibility: but no ſpeech ſerves infallibility but ἐνέργεια γίνου.

*And all thoſe teſtimonies were given to the Iewes as ill as they were diſpoſed.* Anſ. he ſeemes to miſtake what I ſaid formerly about indiſpoſition to receive infallibility. For I ſpoke of it in order to thoſe who ſhould receive the gift of it for the Church, and he now ſeems to ſpeake of it in order to the people. But 2. Suppoſe there were as good a diſpoſition, the poſſibility hereof cannot conclude the ſame neceſſity of the ſame aſſiſtance, and ſome of their men are named by ſome of ours for denying any ſuch diſpoſition towards ſuch a meaſure of the ſpirit as formerly was given.

That the *Scripture hath ſtill the ſame certainty*, he ſaies categorically, *is apparently falſe*; ſpeaking as you ſpeake

ſpeake in order to aſſure us &c. Anſ. All his reaſons are invalid. For as for the firſt that I confeſs ſome books of Scripture were formerly not acknowledged by all which now are received, this is of no weight; becauſe it is ſufficient to my diſcourſe that they have ſtill the ſame certainty from the time of their general reception. And 2. They have in themſelves allwaies the ſame credibility, as well as his Traditions, as he hath noted before.

And that *many and a good many books of Scripture are quite loſt*, is firſt, in thoſe termes at leaſt, a ſuppoſition. Whether any be loſt is yet work for *Tiſhbi*, ſpecially whether many, much more whether a good many, but it is obvious to a Romaniſt that denies the Scripture to be ſufficient, to find it imperfect in the matter. In ingenuity he ſhould have ſaid nothing herein, leſt he ſhould be interpreted for his own ends. As the *Socinian*, who denies Chriſts ſatisfaction, to prove his opinion denies Chriſt's Divinity, that ſo the ſatisfaction ſhould not be ſufficient: ſo the Romaniſt, leſt the Scripture ſhould be thought to be a ſufficient rule, ſaies a good part of it is loſt. Thus with their honeſty they have loſt their modeſty. Secondly, let them again conſider how much prejudice comes to their Church (which they ſay is the depoſitary of Chriſtian Doctrine) upon the loſs of a *good many books of Scripture*. Thirdly yet *dato, non conceſſo*, ſuppoſe ſo, yet that which doth remain is ſurely as ſufficient as the old Scripture without all the new. Fourthly my words do not engage me in this debate, becauſe they are of a capacity to be underſtood of that Scripture which doth remain. Fifthly, If any be loſt, me thinks as the *Sibills* books, the reſt ſhould bear a better price. And as to his other exceptions about the ſenſe of Scripture, about the Sacrament of the Euchariſt, or of Baptiſm, whether to Infants, *or to be a Prieſt or a Biſhop was to have power to ſacrifice or abſolve or not*, we

we say first, that we have said enough already. And we say, that we need not say any more in these points, till they make good these postulates. First whether the exact knowledge of these points be necessary to Salvation. Secondly, whether, if not, they can yet prove an infallible Judge in all points of controversie appointed to us by God. And as to the last, they are first to prove a real sacrifice in the time of the Gospel, otherwise there will be no object for a special act of a Priest, as such. And absolution simply we deny not; their absolution to be necessary to salvation, and that it can make attrition to be as good as contrition, are tasks for them to prove who affirm them.

And as for that he saies, that *then they had the Apostles themselves or the known Disciples of the Apostles to tell them the meaning of those words*. He does not well consider what he saies, if they gave the sense of those places which are obscure, where are these interpretations? why have we not a tradition of them? if not, they say nothing? if so, they must derogate from the Church's fidelity, because it hath justly communicated and handed to us traditions of other matters then are written, and not the sense of those Texts which are written. 2. We are yet entirely able to hold the buckler in the defence of our position, that there is no such need of an infallible exposition of those Texts which contain points necessary for faith or practice. The water where the lambe might wade was clear enough then; and had been yet clear enough, had not the great Fisher troubled the waters for better fishing. If the point of the diall be not fixed, they may vary the shadow, but the sun keeps it regular motion. So if their *gnomon* be loose, they may make the time to go for them. but the sun of righteousnes (Jesus Christ the same yesterday and to day and for ever as the author to the *Hebrews* speaks) doth in an uniforme and regular course shine in the Scripture

Scripture: and the doctrine of Christ by the twelve Apostles is equally set for all times; only the Roman makes the variation, who would have the Scripture follow the Church, and not the Church the Scripture. We need not then yet their *Oedipus*, who hath a foot so great that he must wear a slipper.

The following words in this section are somewhat cloudy; and they do need a clue to shew us their right connexion. His drift seems in them to be this to make me destroy my self by two positions, first *that the Church is secure from damnative errour, though not from all simple errour*, the second this, *Heresie consisted in opposition to clear Scripture*. Ans. One would have thought that a bad conclusion could not lawfully be begotten of these two positions; since specially the second is such as was anciently held by those who do understand distinctly points of divinity. And also I had thought once that he had granted the former; though now, *prore na'ê*, he doth think otherwise. I am sure he had more reason to stand to it, then to abide the perill of the negative. Well, but what from hence? *whence all those must needs be Hereticks, who opposed clear Scripture. Therefore all those who held those prime points in which you and we differ, with us against you, were hereticks: for they held these points which you say, are against clear Scripture* Ans. The Church is considerable in the quantity of it; so it is universal or particular: it is considerable in the quality, invisible or visible: the Church invisible is distributively secure from all damnative errour: the universal visible may be secure from all damnative errour. This we say still. But by what engine is this drawen into his conclusion, which he saies should proceed partly from this position? But 2. What if we grant all that those who have been with them against us in the points of difference were Hereticks; it is but like for like, for they familiarly give us no other name

then

then Hereticks. And I think we ſhall do very few Learned and ſober men any harme, if we ſhould ſay, that all thoſe who have differed from us, are Hereticks. Τυφλὸν ἐν ἐν ſpoins πατέρων μαθὼν but we know on which part the Fathers of the Church ſtood. We can carry our Fathers through the flames of diviſions ſafe, I mean the antient Fathers of the Church. But 3. If they will do us right, upon occaſion for it, we will diſtinguiſh, and ſo do them a favour; but only then they muſt be guilty here of a fallacy of conſequent: for although Hereſie be oppoſite to clear Scripture, yet all which is oppoſite to clear Scripture, by their leave, is not Hereſie. This is a condition of Hereſie: but this is not the eſſentiative of it. There may be and are plain points of Scripture which reſpect circumſtances, and yet theſe are not matters ſufficient to make difference in them to be Hereſie. They account indeed all difference to be Hereſie, becauſe they reſpect not points in order to the matter, but to the propoſal of the Church, which hath it ſelf equali to all: but the tenure of our principles is yet good. And yet this we will grant them, that he who denies any thing, which he confeſſeth to be plain, he is an Arch-Heretick; but not in reſpect to it preſently in the matter, which may be a circumſtance; but in reſpect to it as confeſſed plain, becauſe thus he ſhould deny Gods veracity. And yet 4. the difference is not ſo much in oppoſition to clear Texts as in their obtruding matters of faith for which they have no Text.

He proceeds. *But by your own confeſſion Chriſt had no viſible Church* &c. Anſ. Will he again ſnarl himſelf? Firſt it lyes on the challengers part to make good two points, one that theſe points of difference were held in the Primitive times; and the ſecond that they were held on their ſide. They ſay we have runne away from the antient Catholick Apoſtolick Roman faith; this is work

work for them to prove. And until this be ſettled, we have nothing to ſay to that concluſion, *that Chriſt was with the oppoſers of evident Scripture.* And yet we can ſay alſo γυμνὴ κεφαλή that it is falſe in the propoſition; and falſe in the concluſion; as applied to us. And yet ſomewhat elſe may be ſaid of it by and by. Thus we anſwer them if they intend the words of the primitive times: if they intend them only of the *laſt ages preceding* the *reformation*, we ſay firſt, that we may be ſomewhat more bold becauſe their Church in thoſe times was more degenerated. But 2. We need not deny that Chriſt was with his ordinances even in thoſe times, as to lawfulneſs of baptiſm; and to the poſſibility of ſome's being converted; who might privately abhorr the groſſer errours, or ſimply might ſwallow them as the Whale did *Jonah* undigeſted. *Delictum ambulat cum Capite*; they followed *Abſalom* in the ſimplicity of their heart. Therefore 3. as to the *oppoſers of evident Scripture*, that either Chriſt muſt be with ſuch, according to our ſuppoſitions, or elſe with none for *theſe laſt ages*; we can eaſily diſtinguiſh. To be with them, ſo, as to give them infallible aſſiſtance; or to be with them ſo, as not to withdraw all adminiſtrations of his ordinances, the former ſenſe we can preſently deny Chriſts being with them in; for we deny it to all times after the Apoſtles: in the latter ſenſe we can grant it; and yet they can get nothing by it. Yea we can alſo deny them this; and can anſwer to the other part of the diſjunction, that if not with them then with none for thoſe times: this we can anſwer to, and ſay that his diſjunctive is not yet immediate becauſe many or at leaſt ſome might be led to heaven by the Cloud, as well as in the time of *Elijah*: and as they will ſay, in the time of Anti-Chriſt.

N. 30.

This makes number; being little elſe then a ſyllabus of former Texts. He thinks in them to prove two things, firſt that the ſpirit will be with the ſucceſſours of the

Apostles *for ever*. And 2. Secure them *from errour*, because it is said, *he will guide you into all truth*. And. As for the first we need not stand upon that; for the question is not simply upon Christs continuance with the successours; because we deny it not in termes. But the question is upon the universality of the object [all truth] namely whether it be to be taken reduplicatively to truth; or specificatively to necessary truth. The latter we can grant to the Church as invisible, and to the universal visible. The former we still deny. For first, it respects the Apostles principally, as appeares by the twelth ver. "I have many things to say unto you, but "you cannot bear them now. This must be spoken unto the Apostles personally; and not as they were *personæ supponentes*. But this he takes no notice of. And then again, the opposing of [for ever] by the Spirit to a little while of being with them in body, must referr (as it is noted) to the Apostles, because he was not any time with the successours, in body. Yea also, this will be true in the time of Anti-Christ, will it not? if not, then the promise is not made good; and so Christ should not be as good as his word. If so, then it is extendible in the promise to the Church invisible, when the profession is not so visible. Then why do they arogate it to the Church visible? Again, this equally respects all the successours of the Apostles, doth it not? If it does not; then they should satisfie themselves with a limitation where none is expressed, which lately they would not doe. If it does, then all Bishops are equall, because they all succeeded the Apostles as St. *Jerom* affirmes in his epistle to *Evagrius*. 4. *All truth* must be restrained in regard of the kind; for it must be Theological. Yea also in regard of the specialty, it must be necessary truth, for otherwise how was this promise made good for the first three hundred yeares, wherein there was no Generall Council by their

own

own confession? Put it then into forme, all infallibility is in a Council. In that space there was no Council; then in that space there was not all infallibility; therefore at most only in points necessary. They cannot deny the major, because they annex infallibility, since the Apostles, to a Council. The minor they confess. So then, *the promise of Christ*, which *was made equally to the Apostles and successours*; yes, taking it rightly, equally to all the Apostles amongst themselves; and to all the successours amongst themselves (not equally to the Apostles and to their successours comparatively to both) is yet made good according to its own tenour, in its own sense, with their consequences. Therefore their Romish Divines do carry it more soberly; for so they say upon the place; *and therefore the Church cannot fall into Apostasie or Heresie, or to nothing, as the adversaries say*, they do not say, it cannot fall into any errour: Into Apostasie, or Heresie, or nothing, it cannot fall: but into errour, it may fall. To be sure, this is the surest way unles they had beter arguments against every errour whatsoever, or better answers for the arguments against them.

Nevertheless, we must attend his Syllogism, *all this time all the visible guides or Prelats of the Church were lead and did leade into opinions contrary to the texts of your Church, but all this time the spirit of truth did abide with them, guiding them into all truth, therefore the opinions contrary to your Church were true and not errours.* Well me to trouble them as to Circumstances of forme. To the proposition we can say, that if they intend it of all the times from the Apostles we utterly deny it; if they meanit of the times after the first six hundred yeares of the Church, then we grant the proposition, but utterly deny the assumption, they were not guided by the spirit into such a Latin Edition, into halfe communion. And this denies his proof that those opinions

were true, because they were led into them by the Holy Spirit. This is denied; and is the question. And it is more easily said, that the Holy Spirit was with us by common assistance unto our opinions, then with them by infallible assistance unto their opinions. If we are to judge of their assistance by the effects; we had need of infallible assistance, if it were convenient, for the discourse, to conclude for them: but I am sure we have no need of infallible assistance, to conclude against them.

Neither is it any boot to them that the Spirit leads all into truth: for this may be limited to saving truth. And this is not sufficient for them, who must have absolute infallibility, or none. And then [all] may be limited, as that proposition, [God will have all men to be saved] is limited by *Aquinas* out of St. *Austin* by the like; such a School-Master teacheth all in the Town; whereof the sense is this; not that he teacheth every own simply but all that are taught are taught by him. So the Spirit all leads that are led; but all simply are not led. The limitation then in regard of the object of the Person, or in regard of the object of the thing cuts off all their provision from hence. And when we have sufficiently refuted their points of difference, we have no need to say any thing, that the Holy Spirit should *teach contradictions*, if he were with them and us too; for first, infallible assistance is asserted to neither, but denied: and common assistance doth not exclude all errour; and then 2. The Holy Spirit was not with them infallibly by the effect; for since the same Spirit doth not *teach contradictions*, he did not infallibly teach them that which is opposite to Scripture which he did teach.

That which followes in compare of the visibility of their Teachers with ours or any other Churches, is but a meer flourish. *Shew me a succession in all ages of the Guides*

*Guides and lawfull Paſtours of any Church holding your Tenets in points differing from ours.* Anſ. Succeſſion *de ſe*, is like number, of no value. Therefore they muſt prove their doctrine to be right; otherwiſe it will be a ſucceſſion of errour: for as he ſaid, *Conſuetudo ſine veritate eſt vetuſtas erroris.* 2. It is accidentall to a true particular Church to have ſucceſſion: and the Church at firſt was true antecedently to the ſucceſſion; and ſo the former times muſt never have been certain of their being right, becauſe a Perſecution might afterwards have interrupted their ſucceſſion. 3. The Heretickes bragged of their ſuceſſion too: therefore this is no proper, ſpecial, diſtinctive argument: 4. Where is their ſucceſſion of univerſal Biſhops for the firſt ſix hundred yeares? Then where is their Church? Then either let them not give or take that argument. 5. Our opinions to them are negative: then they are to ſhew a poſitive ſucceſſion in the doctrin of thoſe points, which they can never do; unleſs by their infallibillity *poſt-nate antiquity* ſhould be as good as Primitive. For as for the Fathers of the pureſt times, *tam ſunt omnes noſtri quam* D. *Auguſtinus:* I am ſure we may better ſay ſo, then *Campian.* 6. We can ſhew our doctrine by Scripture, let them ſhew theirs without it. And whatſoever is according to Scripture is true; this they deny not: our doctrine is yet made good to be according to Scripture: therefore the Charter of our points we have the Records of in Scripture: and this way is good enough for us, which is a *poſteriori.* And yet alſo we can tell them that if it had not been for their cruelty and domination, we might better have returned them that which St. *Auſtin* ſaid to the Donatiſts, *vos tam pauci, tam novi, tam turbulenti.* And God hath left us in all ages, of greeks, and others who have given us occaſion to ſay, we hold nothing in the points of difference, but was held before. Therefore this argument doth not ſucceed: ſo that

they

they muſt ſtill *labour to find a reaſon* why our doctrine ſhould not be as good as theirs.

N. 31. The ſenſe of this Section we have had before. And it falls into ſuch a Syllogiſm, whatſoever was Gods end in giving of Paſtours is allwaies compaſſed. That the Church ſhould be without errour, and ſhould not *be as Chidren wavering and carried about with every wind of doctrine*, was Gods end *Epheſ.* 4. 12. Anſ. Whatſoever was Gods end is allwaies compaſſed ſo farr as it was his end, where the effect depends not alſo upon morall cauſes; take it ſo and we grant the major, and deny the minor; it was not Gods end that the Church ſhould be without all errour whatſoever; and the effect doth depend upon moral cauſes; which may hinder the ſucceſs. The end of the Sacraments in the time of the Goſpel, they will ſay was to conferr grace *ex opere operato*; yet they ſay they have not that effect *Ponentibus obicem*. Or thus, whatſoever is Gods end in his will of purpoſe that ſhall ſurely be compaſſed: but what is his end in the will of ſign is not allwaies compaſſed; take it then in the latter ſenſe, ſo I deny the major, take it in the former ſenſe, ſo I deny his minor. For this would be more unreaſonable by their doctrine; for if God ſhould work omnipotently to ſecure men from errour by meanes, how ſhould the obedience of faith be brought under freedome of will? 2. This reſpects alſo particular Churches: and therefore will not ſerve their turne, who, though they make but a particular Church, yet are wont to challenge the priviledges of the univerſal. 3. This Text ſpeakes nothing of the power of Iuriſdiction, but of the power of order, now the duty of our obedience beares reſpect formally to Authority and Iuriſdiction, or do they like ſome of *Geneva*, divide Paſtours and Teachers? And then do they think that the ordinary Paſtour is here principally aimed at in their extraordinary ſenſe? 4. The

end

end of Paſtours then was the end of Paſtours now; to be preſerved by infallibility of Paſtours then was not the end of Paſtours then: therefore not now. The major is true by them, becauſe they apply thoſe words to theſe times of the Church, the minor is alſo true by them, becauſe there was not, by their own confeſſion, Councils held for the firſt three hundred yeares. *The aſſiſtance therefore* is not ſuch as preſerves from all errour. And laſtly, if we were to be preſerved from errour by the *unanimous doctrine of thoſe Doctours and Paſtours*, we ſhould never be ſecured from errour, unleſs in thoſe points wherein we agree. N. 32.

In this number he brings *Eſ.* 59. 20. 1. Compared with the 11. *ch.* to the *Rom.* 26. *ver.* Anſ. Theſe Texts neither diſjunctively nor conjunctively are ſufficient for his intendment. That of *Eſay* is plainly intended for the laſt converſion of the Jew, which is not like to be made by Roman meanes, as Sr. *Edwin Sandys* notes in his Survey of the weſterne Churches.

And as for thoſe wordes, *my words which I have put into thy mouth, are free from errour in all points great and ſmall*, yes, we grant it. This doth not contradict us, but they are to prove that whatſoever they ſay God puts into their mouth. Again it reſpects the Church as inviſible, and that conceit of his that it cannot be ſo taken, becauſe it ſpeaks of the words not departing out of the mouth, is not ſolid; for the uſe of the mouth may be there for confeſſion of the faith, as *Rom.* 10. 10. with the mouth confeſſion is made to God. Now this reſpects not the viſible Church, as teaching, but the inviſible as expreſſing the faith of the heart by the confeſſion of the mouth.

But he again, *Gods ſpirit or word is not in a mouth teaching errour.* Anſ. This is a Sophiſm, it is true in *ſenſu compoſito*, and as teaching errour: but it is not true in *ſenſu diviſo*, Gods ſpirit may be in one, at one time

teaching

teaching truth & in another time not teaching or teaching not truth. He may be in some directing sufficiently to salvation, not sufficiently against all errour, not that the Spirit of God is in any teaching errour, operatively; for whatsoever it is he is operative to in point of beliefe, is truth, but in whom he may be sometimes as teaching truth, he is sometimes not, when they teach errour. For this si yet to be proved by them, that whatsoever is taught in the Church, is suggested and dictated by the Spirit.

Afterwards he taxeth me for taxing any of coming near to blasphemy for saying, *God did speak to us and teach us by his Church*; which he saies here is refuted "*my words shall not depart out of thy mouth.* Ans. I said not so. That which I said, I have answered upon the place, I do not not deny absolutly that God speakes by his Church; but I deny that he speaks now by his Church absolutely, God may speak by his Church that which is infallible: and yet not speak by his Church now infallibly. That which is infallible in the principles of Scripture; not infallibly in the manner of deduction. If he did speak allwaies, and allwaies infallibly, there were no more to be said; until that be proved, we say much is supposed.

N. 33. If it were lawfull, I might smile at his discourse, in this number out of the next *ch.* in *Esay*, and the next to that. For these chapters do plainly regard the Church as invisible, in order to salvation, which is properly applied to the Church, as such: and this is more then truth: for it is possible for a man, not to have any errrour, and yet not to come to Salvation, and it is I hope, possible for a man to come to Salvation, and yet to have some errours. But that this should be said of the Roman Church, and that that should teach all Nations, I say *quid ad diabolum*, Was not the Church of *Ierusalem*; and the Church of *Antioch* before them? Nay it will not be easily proved by them that they were

were Christians, in a formed Church, before us. We may as well say that "the multitude of the Isles *shall* "*be glad thereof*; and that *all Nations and Kingdomes which shall not serve thee shall perish*, should be meant of the Church of *Rome* is as likely as that the Bishop of *Rome* should be Emperour of the world, as they pretend him Monarch of the Church. It was never true surely but then when the Emperours held the Popes stirrup, and the Duke was throwen under the Table. Or it was then true, when the Pope was the Sun, and Emperour the Moon. Or it shall then be true when the Sun riseth in the west. But it should not be true of *Rome*, me thinks, because it is said, "*the* "*dayes of thy mourning shall be ended*. And surely they have been, since the prophecy, sometimes in mourning: and at least shall be, by their own acknowledgment, in the time of Anti-Christ.

And that this should be meant of the Church as visible, because it is said "*thou shalt be called Sought out*, is a slight ratiocination. Rather the contrary, because God seeks it out; therefore it is not visible. Because it is called *Hephtziba* (my delight is in her) therefore visible: Yea rather the contrary; for Gods delight is with the Church invisible; because when his delight is with the Church visible, it is in order to the Church invisible. Because the land shall be called *Beulah*, therefore it should be the Church visible; rather the contrary; for the real union, which is mystical, of Christ with his Church, is to be understood of the Church invisible. And that she should *be to Gods comfort*, namely the visible and the Roman Church; rather the contrary; she is certainly less to his comfort, because she saies so. These promises are made primarily to the Church as invisible, which should be gathered chiefely out of the Gentiles in general, therefore let them again remember that of St. *Jerom* in his Epistle to *Evagrius*, *Orbis maior est urbe*. *Isa.* 62 *ver.* 4.

but he helpeth us with an argument, *If this Church should at any time fall to teach errour, Nations should do well to further their Salvation by forsaking her erring, as the Protestants say they did.* This we take for the maior: and we assume, but this Church hath erred, as hath been sufficiently shewed in the discourse of others, and competently in this; therefore are we justified by my adversaries. And amongst the errours, *quod loquitur inde est*, that she cannot erre.

N. 34. In this he obtrudes again that of *Dan.* 2. 44. And they must be meant he thinks of the Church, of the Church visible, of the visible Roman Church certainly it was well said by the Poet—— *Ait se quid imperat debet regnum* which we may go near to English thus, modesty is unprofitable to him that begges the question. That it is meant of the Kingdome of Christ in his Church, we deny not: but that it is meant of the visible Roman, we flatly deny; and we use for proof, his own principle; that Kingdome which *shall beat in pieces and consume all those Idolatrous Kingdomes and shall stand for ever*, is the Kingdome meant there. So then. But the Roman Church is not that Kingdome which shall do so: therefore that is not it which is meant there. The minor is proved. First they are not agreed amongst themselves whether the Church be a Kingdome. And if they hold it so they hold it erroneously, or else the antient Church erred; for they looked for a Church in the Common-wealth, not for a Common-wealth in the Church, as he said; and then sure it did not stand for ever in the quality of a Kingdom. 2. If they take it in the letter, then it hath temporal dominion directly; which I think they will not say, since every one of them, as before, is not perswaded to hold a temporal dominion indirectly, and *in ordine ad Spiritualia*. If they do not take it in the letter, then it is meant of the mystical Kingdome: and this properly respects the Church invisible.

invisible. 3. Have they broken down all Idolatrous Kingdomes? have they broken down the Turke and Persian? Yea, if they be a kingdome, there is one Idolatrous Kingdome more, which is not broken down, and that is theirs. Therefore are they bound by this argument to break down all their Idolls. But they hate Idols, as *Cyril* of [illegible]*salem* said Anti-Christ should do, Μίσων εἰδωλα ὁ Ἀντίχριστος μισεῖ γὰρ εἴδωλα ἵνα ἐν τῷ ναῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ. Anti-Christ will hate Idols, that he may sit in the Temple of God: so they break down all other Idolatrous Kingdomes, that theirs may stand alone. And 5. Upon this account, we should have had better measure from them, because I do not read that they have charged us with Idolatry. And yet they have endeavored to break us down as much or more then any others.

Again, it is meant of such a *Church as hath not falne into Heresie*; Yea? then we assume, the Church of *Rome* hath falne into Heresie by *Liberius*, by *Vigilius*, as before. Therefore the Roman Church is not it which it is meant of. Again that Church which denies the Catholick Church, as such, is heretical. Their Church denies the Catholick Church, as such: for they restrain the Catholick Church to the Roman, by annexing the Roman to the Catholick. The proposition is good, because, to deny the Catholick Church as such, is to deny an Article of the Apostles Creed. Therefore to check their usurpation, the African Council cut off appeals to *Rome*: thus then it is not *Daniels* Kingdome, but a tyranny, which is τυραννικὸν καὶ φθορὰ τῶν βασιλειῶν, as the Politicks say.

Again *if the Church should have universally fallen into uncertainty of true belief, it should no longer have been the standing kingdome of Christ, which shall stand for ever.* We assume, but their Church must fall into uncertainties of true belief, as we have shewed; therefore their Church

is not it, and becauſe there is uncertainty, therefore they have no *divine faith*, as he concludes. Again, their Church is not *ſpread over the world* in the quality of a Kingdome, therefore their Church is not that kingdome. How many parts of the world are there, wherein they cannot exerciſe a viſible juriſdiction? nor do they break *all Idolatrous kingdomes* with their *viſible Preachers*. What? they break? rather by the ſword than by the word; by the mouth of the ſword, not by the ſword of the ſpirit. Their breaking is indeed the right reading of the ſecond Pſalm thou ſhalt break them with a rod of iron, which *Bellarmin* would conſtrue to be feeding in the original, miſtaking the root, or deceiving his Reader.

Yet *if the Roman Church be not this Church, find me out a viſible Church.* Anſ. Firſt ſuppoſe we could not, yet this were no argument for infallibility, it might make ſomewhat towards probability; if the ſuppoſition were firſt proved, that there muſt be ſuch a Church alwaies in a flouriſhing viſibility. Secondly, we take it yet for the Church as inviſible, and therefore his demand is unreaſonable. Thirdly their Church had not, in doctrine and diſcipline, that viſibility in the firſt ages of the Church, and therefore there was a Church, which had the priviledges of the Church viſible, and yet not theirs, but he tells us we ſhall have more of this in its place. So then this is but a preluſory weapon.

N. 35. Here again he comes upon me for clear texts to prove the controverſie about the *infallibility of the Church*, to be decided by Scripture. Anſ. This hath been abundantly ſpoken to before. In reſpect to what he ſaies now, that I muſt bring *clearer Texts* of Scripture to prove the fallibility of the Church, then he to prove the infallibility, we add, that if he underſtands by [*clearer Texts*] as by reaſonable conſequence and deduction, it is done: if he underſtands them expreſſely *συντακτῶς*, and

in

in termes, he speaks unreasonably; because he hath brought none such; and therefore he cannot look for clearer; because comparation is *in eodem genere*. So that this is not much more then a cavil. For if the Scripture be sufficiently furnished with necessary direction, why should it be thought defective in not determining in termes that controversie, which is needless, if that be otherwise sufficient

And as for the Item he gives me, that the Texts I bring, must be for the *Church not for the Synagogue*; for he saies all his Texts *speak of that, not of the Synagogue*, I am very well contented with this law. All that I have produced looks that way: but his have not. For besides those Texts which he produced out of the Old Testament, which in the letter, beare respect to the Jew, he urgeth that Text of Christ, *dic Ecclesiæ*, which by the termes hath more respect to the Synagogue, then any which I formerly made use of.

*And you must bring Texts and not discourses, or else you decide not the Controversie by the sentence of the Iudge to which only you appeale.* Ans. This compliance with the Anabaptist requites their Freindship. Is not that Scripture which is plainely deduced out of Scripture? As the conclusion is potentially contained in the principles; so that which is in principles of Scripture is contained in Scripture. So our Saviours, " you erre not knowing the Scriptures & then proves the resurrection by that which is said " [I am the God of *Abraham* the God of *Isaac* and " the God of *Iacob*] so then Christ proved the resurrection not by the Text, in the termes affirming it, but by the Text consequently as deducing it. 2. they do not consider how little they have in Scripture for Sr. *Peters* successour; for halfe communion, merit of works, the Sacrifice of the Masse; and some others where are they read in Scripture? 3. They would have

Religion

Religion with reason and prudential motives, would they not? Then they cannot dis-accept discourses from Scripture. 4. I do not deny to be judged by reasoning out of Scripture: no nor by antiquity neither, though it be not an argument *ad rem*, but they have more need to brag of them, because they are not theirs. 5. I do not appeal to Scripture as a formal Judge, but as to the law by which all Judgment is to be made. And again, as the Philosopher, those the best lawes which leave least to the Judge. All things then considered, he hath reason to quit *the field* unless he hath a minde to encamp against the truth. And if they have so much for them in Scripture, and in direct words as here he cracks; surely those Romanists who have spoken of Scripture so diminutively have not been so wise as they might have been. So then this Paragraph we may end with this account; the *Socinian* is supposed to plead reason against Scripture and the Church; The Papist pleads the Church without reason or the Scripture; The Protestant pleads Scripture with reason and the Church Catholick.

N. 36. This concerns the reading of a place in St. *Austin De utilitate credendi*, which he quoted about the authority of the Church, thus, *velut gradu certo innitentes*; I found it in a Froben Edition otherwise, namely thus, *velut gradu incerto nitentes*: He saies it is in an antienter Froben, as he reads it. And besides, he thinks the scope might lead me to his reading. Ans. The scope directs us to think the authority of the Church to be but as moving, not as determining Faith, as I have shewed upon another place of St. *Austin*, which he replies nothing to. Moved we are by that authority as an uncertain step to God by whom we are assured, not to God as the object of worship, but to God as the author of our faith. And as for his objection, that it is ridiculous to be helped *to certain truth* by authority uncertain

uncertain, it is not of much weight. For although uncertainty formal is not helpful unto truth, yet that which is uncertain for us to rely upon may be helpfull. As the Catholick Moderator observes of the Huguenot in point of justification, that he is somewhat nice because he will not lay hold upon such a bough which peradventure might save him, yet is he not to be blamed, because he doth rely upon the righteousnes of Christ, which is a certain bough, and will surely save him: so it may be we are thought too scrupulous, because we will not leane and rest our faith upon the authority of the Church; yet are we not to be blamed, because we rest it upon God. Yet may we then rely upon a bough uncertain till we come to a ground more certain. The voice of the woman of *Samaria* was not certain: yet the people were moved to come to Christ by what she said; but afterwards they found better satisfaction from himself; and then gave an account of their faith, not by her voice, but because they had *seen him*.

And as for miracles which were spoken of to be part of St. *Austin*'s authority, he thinks they were no *unassured step*; it is easily answered, that however this doth derogate from the application of that Text to the authority onely of the Church, since the authority he speaks of is not onely of the Church. But Secondly, miracles when they are received, are an argument to confirm the truth: but miracles are not to us an assured step, because we are not certain of them to be true: Since we hear in Scripture of lying wonders, 2 *Thes.* 2. 9, 10. So that the doctrine rather proves the miracle than the miracle the doctrine. The doctrine is to be believed without a miracle, but the miracle is not to be believed when the doctrine is false, as *Deut.* 13. *v.* 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.

But then as to the reading of that place in St. *Austin*, somewhat more may be said. It is true that in an edition of *Basil* 529. it is *Certo*, but yet there is some marke

marke with it to note a *Criticism in a various lection.* In two other editions it is *gradu incerto.* But also we except against the Latin in the grammer of it, if it be read his way; for where will they finde the verbe [*innitor*] to govern an ablative? *Nitor* doth; but *innitor* doth not. And in reading *Stapleton's* relections I finde he useth [*innitor*] with a Dative. Therefore may it be probable that our reading is the right: and that the [*in*] changed its place; and in stead of *gradu incerto nitentes*, it was made *gradu certo innitentes.*

N. 37. In this he resumes the speech upon the authority of the Devil when he saies any thing conformable to Scripture. To this I said more then was necessary. Another would have sent it back to the place from whence it came. But that which I said liberally he exagitates disingenuously.

I answered first that we are forbidden to consult with the Devil; but are injoyned to consult with the Church. To this he rejoyns, *this hinders not his being conformable as long as he speaketh conformably to Scripture.* Repl. This was proposed by him to presse us to the use of the Church, therefore that which was said by me properly made a difference betwixt them, because we are to take direction from one not from the other, even for those things which we know he knowes most certainly. Therefore though there be no difference in the matter of truth as to both: yet there is as to the immediate Authour.

And I granted to them ever that the Church to be consulted with ever, is the Church as *visible.* Yet doth it not from hence follow, I hope, that it should be allwaies so visible, as that we can consult with it. The visible Church is ever to be consulted with: but this visible Church is not ever so visible; visible at sometimes; not so visible at all times. For there was not allwaies in the Church a Pope and Council; and if a Pope, not a Council, by their own confession. And in such

such cases, they have said before that the Church must content it self with former determinations. And though that which is infallible may be orderly consulted with; yet not all that is to be consulted with is not surely infallible. Every Priest is not infallible I think they will say; and yet is to be consulted.

My Second answer is of the same kind and that, which he saies would be of some weight, if we granted not such use to be made of the Church, as thereby to think well of that which is proposed, but the certainty of faith is, *cui non potest subesse falsum* this is not to be given to the Church simply.

As for the Third answer, we say easily, there is no comparative in negatives: neither is the one nor the other infallible; though I am more moved by the one whom we have reason to respect, the Church, than the other, whom we have reason to suspect.

So then, that which is apprehended true is considerable either abstractly from the speaker, or complexely with the speaker; in the former it is considered with respect to the matter; and so he said well, οὐ τὸν λόγον τι, we are not to look at so much the author as the matter, in the latter respect it is respective to the motive: and so I am more induced by the Church, though not determined. And therfore as to those termes, *to whose saying you would give an infallible assent, when you see that which he saith to be conformable to Scripture*, we say that the terme [saying] is distinguishable into the object purely, or into the object with the act and authour. In the former there is no difference: in the latter there is, we may believe that which is said, when we do not believe him that saies it. And so may we believe rather the Church, whose *office* it is to propose truth, as he confesseth it is not the Divell.

Neither did we by these answers *smother up* any thing which *clearly overthroweth* our *replie*, who say we must follow the Church onely so far as we see her follow Scrip-

ture. That which he saith here doth no way weaken our replie. It hath been answered before; and the strength of it broken. For first though *they could not see at all how far the Church followed the Scripture for the first two thousand years, and the barbarous Nations never having seen the Scripture did truely believe*, doth this hinder us from holding now that we are to believe the Church, in points of faith, no further then we see grounds for what they said, out of Scripture? take it of faith divine and in things of faith, it is yet good. And their instances do not evacuate it. *Distingue tempora*, distinguish the times, God might in that time and season of immediate revelation work then a faith immediately; which now is not reasonable to expect ordinarily, as appears by the first Chap. of the Ep. to the Hebrews the first ver. *Privilegia paucorum non faciunt regulam communem*. Secondly the Faith of the barbarous nations was not terminated in the Church, as if they had believed the Church, and therefore believed that which was said by them: But was terminated in the matter which was said by the Church: The Church was instrumental to the knowledge of the matter, and might be instrumental as to dispose them for faith: But the authority of the Church was not the formal cause of the act of faith. And *Knotts* himself is loath to assert it. And this is that which *Tertullian* hath said, *non ex persona fides, sed ex fide persona æstimanda est*. We are not to esteem the doctrine by the person, but the person by the doctrine. And the tradition which St. *Irenæus* speaks of, was the sum of the Christian Faith, which is in Scripture: So he as before, and so St. *Cyril* of *Hierusalem* understands it, as may appear by that of *Cyril* in his fourth Catech. Δεῖ γὰρ περὶ τῶν θείων καὶ ἁγίων τῆς πίστεως μυστηρίων μηδὲ τὸ τυχὸν ἄνευ τῶν θείων γραφῶν παραδίδοσθαι λεγόμενον. we must not deliver any thing in the divine and holy mysteries of faith without the divine Scriptures.

This

This is the Epilogue of the Chap. and is of use onely N. 38
to tell me what he hath done (I think not done) before, and this is all the answer he gives me for taking away what he had said out of two places of Scripture foremen tioned, towards infallibility. Before he referred me for satisfaction to the due place; here he referrs me back again.

And as for any reply to my answer out of the Fathers, or my use of them, he saies to me, *you know why I resolve to pass them.* Yes, & particularly why he saies nothing more to what I said about S t. *Austins* testimony in his Epistle against the Manichee. If I may be interpreter, it is thus resolved, he had good reason to *pass them*, because they pass him. And so we have made an end of his long, but not hard Chapter.

## CHAP. V.

## No Church is our Iudge infallible, then not the Roman.

*This Chapter which concerns the Hypotheſis ſhould in juſtice have been longer, but he reduceth the proof of it to a ſmall pittance, and if all the Churches* which ſubmit not themſelves to the Biſhop of *Rome* as their ſupreme Paſtour, *be of no better proportion, it will be Catholick for all that do ſubmit, but not for all.*

But ſince he is ſo ſhort in this, we will be even with him; and bring all he ſaies in this ſecond Treatiſe (for ſo ſome times he calles it) into one Syllogiſm; the Church is the Judge infallible appointed in buſineſſes of Religion. No other but the Roman is this Church; therefore. To the propoſition we have ſaid enough before. He would now make good the aſſumption (or præſumption, as we might ſpeak) ſuppoſing the propoſition to be demonſtrated; ἴσως ὑπὸ πάντων, and therefore he quarrels with me, becauſe we except againſt his ſuppoſition of it. It is true had the major been a maxim irrefragable, then there had been more reaſon to blame us for exception againſt it, and for not applying our ſelves in preſent addreſs to the minor; but ſince we ſee no cauſe, nor the Churches of God, why the propoſition ſhould

should be swallowed, we call upon him to make good the thesis, that there is a Church appointed as infallible Judge in busineſſes of Religion; and therefore we told him that he might as well prove he had right to *Utopia*, becauſe he only claimes it; whereas he ſhould firſt prove the *An ſit?* whether there be ſuch a place. And therefore if he would have had us ſay nothing to the queſtioning of the ſuppoſition, he ſhould have made it ſtronger firſt, and then ſhould not have concluded bravingly that therefore all he had ſaid of the Church, was to be applied to the *Roman, no other being infallible*, as in the former treatiſe, *num.* 28,

Well, but he muſt prove his minor, becauſe all other Churches do not lay claime to this infallibility; and are demonſtrated to be fallible; we grant the Antecedent, without any proof, and his proof was not ſo good as his propoſition. But therefore, it belongs to them to be infallible; we deny the conſequence. We deny the Title upon the claime. And he is angry, becauſe we make his plea from the claim to be weak. And the weaknes of it appeares in that it is weaker grounded upon a true ſuppoſition, nor is it very ſound in the proceeding of the conſequence, in the firſt regard, we ſay *debile fundamentum fallit opus*. And therefore ſince that is one of his principles, his concluſion muſt be naught, as before. His conſequence he proveth thus, *the Proteſtant Church and all other Churches different from the Roman do Iudge themſelves, acknowledge themſelves, declare and profeſs themſelves to be fallible and that according to infallible Scripture. If then any of theſe Churches be infallible (in what they Iudge and declare for truth grounded in Scripture) they are infallible in this their Iudging and declaring themſelves to be fallible; therefore infallibly they are fallible. Therefore upon ſuppoſition that it hath been formerly proved, that ſome Church is Iudge of controverſies, and infallible, and it being by the former argument demon-* N. 2.

ſtratively

*strenuously proved that neither the Protestant Church nor any Church different from the Roman can be Iudge of controversies and infallible; it evidently followeth that the Roman Church is this Iudge and infallible, as she teacheth her self to be.* This is the whole procedure of his discourse. Herein he hath a supposition that there is some Church which is Iudge of controversies and infallible, this is not yet, nor can ever be proved. And here is also another supposition that no Church different from the Roman, hath claimed this priviledge upon declaring her self infallible: But this may be demurred upon; for in effect and by way of interpretation, this was done by the Donatists, who like the Roman separated themselves from their Brethren and taught no salvation but in *parte Donati*. And therefore his discourse is more weak while we question his suppositions: but yet supposing his suppositions to be good; first, this makes them not to be infallible by way of consequent, if by way of consequence. For that none other Church doth claim this infallibility is extrinsical and accidental to the Roman right; and it doth little victory, relate to possession rather then right. And if truth of right, should right of truth be given *primo occupanti? Veritas est virgo semper*, as he said; *nondum occupatur*. And therefore the necessity of consequence is left to shift for it self, since all that can be said for it, comes to pass, in the matter, upon this accidental negative: for if any Church of the world had been as bold as the Roman in claiming this infallibility, they had had it before them: but because there hath not been claim laied to it by other Churches, that which they have found and taken up, must belong to them.

Therefore, what he saies that I make him argue thus, *the Roman Church claimeth infallibility, therefore by claiming it she hath right to it*, is no great slander, though the termes might not be the same: for he doth little else in his former treatise, when he saies, *All*

*other*

*other Churches of all other Religions do say indeed that they are themselves, the only true Churches, but none of them say themselves to be either the Iudges of controversies or to be infallible; therefore they cannot be either Iudges or infallible.* And what sense is this argument resolved into, but this; that the claiming makes the right, and therefore he might somewhat have spared a reproach which falls upon him. Neither is it true, *that all other Churches of all other Religions do say indeed that they are the only true Churches.* And this I noted before; for which nothing is said to me now.

But he saies, *I say nothing to that* which he *presseth* and *still doth press*, that the *Church which is appointed by God for infallible Iudge of controversies, cannot possibly be any of those Churches, which teach themselves not to be this infallible Iudge.* No? Have I said nothing to it? Yes, I have said as much, as he could prove, that none of those Churches are such a Church. And I have also said that his supposition was to be denied; and to this supposition of his my proposition is contradictory; no Church is appointed by God to be infallible Iudge. But, because he hath been a valiant supposer, I must be accounted a weak disputant. If he includes the supposition in the argument for one of the propositions, I deny that proposition. And if he will yet conclude, he makes it a formal Enthymem, but in vertue none. And therefore I said to him in termes, "first then make it "out that there is such an infallibility to be had, be- "fore you challenge it, and do not prove the being of "it by the challenging of it, lest the Roman Eagle be said to catch at flies.

Yet he goes on, *It had been very easie to understand this right, and not to make me say that onely laying claim to infallibility is a sufficient proof of infallibility. Ans.* I think that I have understood more then my adversaries have been contented with. And I say yet it is *easie to understand*

here

here an argument by a claim. And so they must do, if they will conclude their Church to be the infallible judge. It is the best plea they have upon the supposition; and the only plea without it. And I have the less to do, because he denies this *argument* to be a sufficient proof, if not that, & the rest may answer themselves. And I say as he saies in this that though a *Minister must be a man*, yet it followeth not that such an one should be a Minister *because he is a man and not a woman* (unless Pope *Ioane*) because one is more general, and therefore the proposition is not simply converted; yet if he saies against us, *the Church which is infallible judge must be a Church judging and teaching her self to be infallible, and cannot be a Church which judgeth and teacheth her self fallible*, and if he makes this an argument, then he makes it an argument for himself, that their Church is the infallible judge, because it teacheth her self to be so. And yet he saies, *this I said not, but I said that Church that must be infallible must not want this condition; and therefore no Church teaching her self* (*even according to Scripture*) *to be fallible, can truly be this infallible judge.* Ans. This evasion will do them no good. A condition hath it self by way of an inseperable accident: but this inseperable accident, when it is denied to any other, is as a property, and therefore beareth *vim argumenti*, the force of an argument; and I presume they thus intended it. Let them therefore choose. But if it be *one thing to say the Church which is the infallible judge, must be a Church judging and teaching her self infallible, and another thing to say that that Church is infallible judge which teacheth her self to be so*, then that Church which teacheth her self to be infallible may yet not be the infallible judge; and so there is destroyed (and by himself) also the necessity of consequence. But secondly, to answer them in kind, the Church which teacheth her self infallible is in this fallible, their Church teacheth her self to be infallible, the assumption is theirs; the proposition

is proved thus, either it is true or the antient Church was not infallible, because it did not teach her self to be infallible; which he saies is a necessary condition. Therefore either their consequence is not good, or they prove thereby the antient Church not to be the true Church, and so to be different from theirs. Thirdly, put case some other Church should bethink themselves as the Greek Church, and pretend to be infallible, the Roman consequence would hold but *pro tempore*; for then notwithstanding the supposition supposed, the question which Church is the infallible judge, is yet to be decided by the Word or by the Sword. And therefore, *considerativ considerandis*, if he hath no other hold for his Hypothesis he hath none. And so *Lycurgus* the Lawmaker might well die in *Crete* for his fiction that the laws he gave the people came from *Apollo* of *Delphos*.

As to the charge against their Church about the Millenary opinion, he would here answer it, *that it was not admitted by the supreme pastour of the Church defining with the Church assembled in a Council*. Ans. first If this were a reason, it would destroy all the traditions for three hundred years, because they were not admitted by the supreme Pastour defining with the Church in a general Council, for they say there was no council for the first 300 years. But secondly, was not tradition then an infallible rule? if it was, that is no answer: if not, the Scripture; or there was no infallible rule at all, and this contradicts them in both; for they say there was an infallible rule, and not Scripture. N. 3.

But he would also say, it was not generally admitted by the *Church diffused or universal*. Ans. But I hope the diffused Church adds no authority to a matter of faith? This was indeed *Alphonsus a Castro's* opinion; but my

adverſary was not of capacity for that conceit, becauſe he annexeth authority to the Pope and a Council; and if the diffuſed Church (which includes the people) have any moment towards credibility, why is it denied to them to have the judgment of private diſcretion, ſince their conſent alſo makes a ſuffrage? And as for the *diverſe Fathers* not holding it as a Tradition, they may excuſe us certainly, unleſs they will prove it. He ſhould not ſurely prove it by *Juſtin*; for he is accounted for it, himſelf, though many did not acknowledg it. Διὰ τῶν πολλῶ is ſufficient for a Tradition. Is it not? If not, let them ſhew more for other Traditions which they hold: if ſo, then that went for one. And then the *many* were not Fathers: St. *Auſtin* otherwiſe. Neither doth this conclude againſt *Catholick Tradition* in all uſe; but may in point of faith, till we be aſcertain of Tradition. Till that time I am ſatisfied with the former place of *Cyrill* of *Jeruſalem*, and when we ſhall be as certain of Tradition derived from the Apoſtles times through all ages of the Church, in points of Faith, then we ſhall not urge this plea, that if this opinion of an Apoſtolical Tradition was ſo current in the Church upon the credit of one *Papias* at firſt, how ſhall we be ever ſure, in the account of Traditions, which is which?

N. 4. He hath learned to ſpeak here high, that he might at leaſt at laſt go off with noyſe. He calls it a *demonſtration*; which yet by his own words is to be held up by a ſuppoſition. Neither upon the ſuppoſition ſuppoſed will it be very neare a demonſtration; for it concludes not *per ſe* but by accident: and alſo it concludes rather or primarily negatively, that other Churches are not the infallible Judge. And if the diſcourſe were good, it would come to this, that other Churches ſhould fare the worſt for their modeſty, and the Roman ſhould fare the better for their impudency. And if the antient

Church

Church was infallible, notwithstanding it did not say that it was infallible (or else they differ from the antient Church in an essentiall prædicate) then their Church is no infallible, notwithstanding it saies that it is infallible. So then upon the whole matter, his *supposition* is not *admitted*; and therefore, could they well prove their Church to be fairer for this priviledge then any other, the supposition being admitted; yet since it is not admitted, it proves nothing *in re*, nor by their own confession. And yet if it were admitted, his discourse would not make him to be as good as his word in a *demonstration*. And yet this ratiocination of his, instead of an *un-answerable argument* against us (but is proved not to be so) may be an unanswerable argument against them, that they lie at catch, and have need of that which all other Churches have left; and also it proves that they have no better proof. What I said more to what he said more by anticipation, he saies nothing to. But he ingageth himself in the end to a better account of the *Roman Church*. So then I have for the present my discharge [illegible]. yet his Epiphonema is this.

*Petræ duritiei nulli magis quam feriemi notæ.*

And, not to be behind hand with him, I return him that of St. *Basil*, [illegible]

FINIS.

Errata

*Errata, which the judicious and candid Reader is desired to correct.*

Page 71 l. 9. r. unconfined p. 84. l. 6. r. Pelagians, p. 113. l. 7. r. decrees, p. 116. l. 2. r. withdrawn. p. 122. l. 19. r. 128. l. 7. r. these, p. 148. l. 25. r. destruction. p. 236. l. 30. r. equitableness, p. 238. l. 20. r. properly, p. 248. l. 36. r. hatred, p. 258. l. 7. r. 1024. p. 328. l. 42. r. distiens [this errour is to be corrected at the words there for these or their as often as it occurs] p. 341. l. 3. r. [illegible] p. 369. l. 9. darkness p. 428. l. 28. r. less p. 529. l. 5. r. [illegible] p. 534. l. 11. r. Catholics, p. 535. l. 14. r. Lesbian rule, p. 588. l. 6. r. Homoousian. p. 590. l. 43. r. Sophisms, p. 594. l. 25. dele a. p. 550. l. 36. r. [illegible] p. 593. l. 25. r. quæritur, p. 594. l. 13. r. sworn, p. 603. l. 28. r. duties, p. 629. l. 31. r. long p. 661. l. 25. r. quæ. ibid. l. 28. unusquisque, p. 680. l. 15. r. Agenda, p. 695. in the margin r. Dr. Potter, p. 726. l. 30. r. [illegible] p. 730. l. 3. r. decretory weapons, p. 742. l. 15. r. now, p. 744. l. 26. r. a pede non ad non pede, non valet, p. 800. [which should be p. 830.] l. 28. r. Cardinal's. p. 946. l. 3. r. [illegible] ibid. l. 13 r. Fraudatis. p. 953. l. 4. r. qui ne le croit, p. 964. l. 10. r. by images. p. 971. l. 2. r. Greek Latin Edition. p. 977. l. 19. r. without indempnity. p. 980. l. 7. r. Antoninus, p. 985. l. 16. r. Encratites. p. 994. l. 23. r. joyn with her the Church, p. 1000 l. 21 r. [illegible] p. 1060. l. 19. r. one, p. 1066. l. 14. r. [illegible].

*The mistakes of the Printer in false pointing, litterals and folio's may be rectified in reading.*